HISTORY OF THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH,

WITH A GENERAL INTRODUCTION TO CHURCH HISTORY.

BY THE REV. PHILIP SCHAFF, D. D.

1 vol. 8vo., 700 pages. Price $3.75.

"We believe it to be the most thorough and complete work on the Church of the first century, which has ever been published in the English language. We do not except from this remark Neander's celebrated 'History of the Planting and Training of the Christian Church by the Apostles.'"—*Philadelphia Presbyterian.*

"A luminous and truly philosophical church history. The author shows himself a thorough master of his subject, capable alike of dealing in minute details without being tedious, and of illustrating great principles without being unduly abstract. He never leaves us for a moment in doubt in respect to his meaning, but throws every statement into broad sunlight. It is certainly a remarkable work, and must be the product of a remarkable mind."—*Puritan Recorder.*

"This book is eminently scholarlike and learned, full of matter, not of crude materials crammed together for the nonce by labor-saving tricks, but of various and well-digested knowledge, the result of systematic training and long-continued study. Besides evidence of solid learning which the book contains, it bears impress of an original and vigorous mind, not only in the clear and lively mode of representation, but also in the large and elevated views presented, the superiority to mere empirical minuteness, and the constant evidence afforded that the author's eye commands, and is accustomed to command, the whole field at a glance, as well as to survey more closely its minuter subdivisions. In point of style, and indeed of literary execution generally, there is no Church History in German known to us, excepting that of Hase, that deserves to be compared with that before us."—*Princeton Review.*

"The work bears upon it the marks of true learning, and independent, vigorous thought, from the first page to the last. It is a model of historical order and clearness." —*Bibliotheca Sacra and Am. Bible Repository, for Oct. 1852, and for Jan., 1853.*

"We have now before us a volume of a truly scientific work produced on our own soil but by a German scholar. It has this great advantage over the richest works of the kind in Europe, that the author combines the painstaking accuracy and scientific insight of the German, with the practical religious life of the American mind."—*Methodist Quarterly Review.*

"We predict for this work great success, not only in this country, which may in some degree claim it, but in Europe, not excluding the Fatherland of its author. Dr. Schaff presents to us discussions on the numerous and momentous subjects, of which the outlines have been given, marked with great ability, sound judgment, elevated piety, extensive research, and genuine catholicism. We think that our common Christianity, in the various evangelical forms in which it is found, will bring no charge of heresy, utter no complaint, and manifest no disappointment. It strikes us that it would be exceedingly difficult to write a book of this kind, we mean an honest book, as we are satisfied this is, that would embrace so much that all Christians regard as true, and at the same time so little from which there might be dissent. From the first page to the last we admire the soundness, we may say orthodoxy of the writer. The literary execution of this work is admirable."—*Evangelical Review.*

"This book is one of the best compendiums extant, of church history. It is thoroughly Christian, its arrangement clear, its style lively and attractive, and it contains notices of the most recent German and other opinions on every question as it rises."—*Edinburgh Review, for January,* 1853.

"This is the first learned theological work, in German, composed in the United States, and undoubtedly the best published on that subject in that country. I hail the work in both respects as the harbinger of a great and glorious future. It is worthy of a German scholar, of a disciple of Neander, (to whom the work is dedicated,) a citizen of the United States, and of a believing and free Christian and Protestant; it stands on German ground, but it is none the less original for that."—*Dr. Bunsen's Hyppolytus.*

Copies sent by Mail, post paid, on receipt of price.

REV. DR. P. SCHAFF'S

HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

Comprising the First Three Centuries, from the Birth of Christ to the Reign of Constantine the Great, A. D. 1—311. 1 vol. 8vo. $3 75.

"Dr. Schaff possesses a true Teutonic erudition, which he expresses in the best Anglo-Saxon clearness, and with a Celtic vivacity and effect."—*Methodist Quarterly Review.*

"This volume seems to us to have all the merits of the author's previous publications, which are too well known to need description here, and which have placed him in the first rank of contemporary writers on Church History, not only in this country, but in Germany and England."—*Princeton Review.*

"Dr. Schaff has written a perspicuous, animated, often eloquent, and always trustworthy narrative. This is high praise when we look at the deficiencies of the best of the current works in this department."—*New Englander.*

"The *North American Review* says:—With this book we are greatly pleased. At the commencement of each section, a list of authorities for its contents is given, and from the sources thus indicated, the author furnishes a free and graceful narrative of what is properly embraced under each title. . . . . . The work is equally well adapted to the needs of the students and the edification of the general reader."

"A familiar acquaintance with the sources of historical knowledge, a mature judgment, a sound, nervous logic, and a lively imagination, pervaded by the energy and warmth of a living faith, and a glowing heart, are all brought to bear upon this work." —*Mercersburg Review.*

"This vol. furnishes proof that Church History can be presented in a way which shall not only instruct, but interest and edify. The reader is drawn along from section to section, and from chapter to chapter, by the natural and necessary succession of subjects, and charmed on every page, by the clear, concise and vigorous style. If any excellence belonging to it impresses us above another, it is its admirable adaptation as a text book in Church History;—we shall be greatly mistaken if it does not as such take its place permanently or extensively in the seminaries of our land."—*The Guardian,* (*Rev. H. Harbaugh.*)

"This volume, whether as a book for general reading or as a text-book for students, is one of the best—perhaps we ought to say the very best—with which we are acquainted, on the eventful periods it embraces."—*New York Examiner.*

"No one can doubt the author's qualifications, both intellectual and religious, for a historian of the Christian Church. He writes under the responsibilities of a Christian conscience, and with the enthusiasm of a Christian heart."—*Christian Mirror.*

"Ministers, theological students, and lovers of Church history will prize this book for its clear, perspicuous style, and catholic and liberal spirit."—*American Presbyterian.*

"It combines, in a happy manner, the thoroughness and accuracy of the German critic with the practical spirit of the American teacher. The style is scholarly, yet clear and animated, the descriptions are brief and bold, the generalizations philosophic, yet not obscure or needlessly abstruse."—*Central Christian Herald.*

"This history is a noble monument to the genius and learning of its distinguished author. It is genial, truthful, transparent, and animated with a soul whose sympathies throb in unison with the great and good of all ages."—*Lutheran Observer.*

Copies sent by Mail, post paid, on receipt of price.

A

COMMENTARY

ON THE

HOLY SCRIPTURES:

CRITICAL, DOCTRINAL, AND HOMILETICAL,

WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO MINISTERS AND STUDENTS.

BY

JOHN PETER LANGE, D.D.

IN CONNECTION WITH A NUMBER OF EMINENT EUROPEAN DIVINES.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN, AND EDITED, WITH ADDITIONS ORIGINAL AND SELECTED,

BY PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D.

IN CONNECTION WITH AMERICAN DIVINES OF VARIOUS EVANGELICAL DENOMINATIONS.

VOL. I. OF THE NEW TESTAMENT: CONTAINING A GENERAL INTRODUCTION, AND THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MATTHEW.

NEW YORK:
CHARLES SCRIBNER, & CO., 124 GRAND STREET.
1865.

THE GOSPEL

ACCORDING TO

MATTHEW,

TOGETHER WITH A GENERAL THEOLOGICAL, AND HOMILETICAL INTRODUCTION TO THE NEW TESTAMENT.

BY

JOHN PETER LANGE, D.D.

PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF BONN.

TRANSLATED FROM THE THIRD GERMAN EDITION, WITH ADDITIONS ORIGINAL AND SELECTED,

BY PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D.

FOURTH EDITION.

NEW YORK:
CHARLES SCRIBNER, & CO., 124 GRAND STREET.
1865

JOHN F. TROW,
PRINTER, STEREOTYPER, AND ELECTROTYPER,
50 Greene Street, New York.

PREFACE TO THE AMERICAN EDITION.

THE BIBLE.

The Bible is the book of life, written for the instruction and edification of all ages and nations. No man who has felt its divine beauty and power, would exchange this one volume for all the literature of the world. Eternity alone can unfold the extent of its influence for good. The Bible, like the person and work of our Saviour, is theanthropic in its character and aim. The eternal personal Word of God "was made flesh," and the whole fulness of the Godhead and of sinless manhood were united in one person forever. So the spoken word of God may be said to have become flesh in the Bible. It is therefore all divine, and yet all human, from beginning to end. Through the veil of the letter we behold the glory of the eternal truth of God. The divine and human in the Bible sustain a similar relation to each other, as in the person of Christ: they are unmixed, yet inseparably united, and constitute but one life, which kindles life in the heart of the believer.

Viewed merely as a human or literary production, the Bible is a marvellous book, and without a rival. All the libraries of theology, philosophy, history, antiquities, poetry, law and policy would not furnish material enough for so rich a treasure of the choicest gems of human genius, wisdom, and experience. It embraces works of about forty authors, representing the extremes of society, from the throne of the king to the boat of the fisherman; it was written during a long period of sixteen centuries, on the banks of the Nile, in the desert of Arabia, in the land of promise, in Asia Minor, in classical Greece, and in imperial Rome; it commences with the creation and ends with the final glorification, after describing all the intervening stages in the revelation of God and the spiritual development of man; it uses all forms of literary composition; it rises to the highest heights and descends to the lowest depths of humanity; it measures all states and conditions of life; it is acquainted with every grief and every woe; it touches every chord of sympathy; it contains the spiritual biography of every human heart; it is suited to every class of society, and can be read with the same interest and profit by the king and the beggar, by the philosopher and the child; it is as universal as the race, and reaches beyond the limits of time into the boundless regions of eternity. Even this matchless combination of human excellencies points to its divine character and origin, as the absolute perfection of Christ's humanity is an evidence of His divinity.

But the Bible is first and last a book of religion. It presents the only true, universal, and

absolute religion of God, both in its preparatory process or growth under the dispensation of the law and the promise, and in its completion under the dispensation of the gospel, a religion which is intended ultimately to absorb all the other religions of the world. It speaks to us as immortal beings on the highest, noblest, and most important themes which can challenge our attention, and with an authority that is absolutely irresistible and overwhelming. It can instruct, edify, warn, terrify, appease, cheer, and encourage as no other book. It seizes man in the hidden depths of his intellectual and moral constitution, and goes to the quick of the soul, to that mysterious point where it is connected with the unseen world and with the great Father of spirits. It acts like an all-penetrating and all-transforming leaven upon every faculty of the mind and every emotion of the heart. It enriches the memory; it elevates the reason; it enlivens the imagination; it directs the judgment; it moves the affections; it controls the passions; it quickens the conscience; it strengthens the will; it kindles the sacred flame of faith, hope, and charity; it purifies, ennobles, sanctifies the *whole* man, and brings him into living union with God. It can not only enlighten, reform, and improve, but regenerate and create anew, and produce effects which lie far beyond the power of human genius. It has light for the blind, strength for the weak, food for the hungry, drink for the thirsty; it has a counsel in precept or example for every relation in life, a comfort for every sorrow, a balm for every wound. Of all the books in the world, the Bible is the only one of which we never tire, but which we admire and love more and more in proportion as we use it. Like the diamond, it casts its lustre in every direction; like a torch, the more it is shaken, the more it shines; like a healing herb, the harder it is pressed, the sweeter is its fragrance.

What an unspeakable blessing, that this inexhaustible treasure of divine truth and comfort is now accessible, without material alteration, to almost every nation on earth in its own tongue, and, in Protestant countries at least, even to the humblest man and woman that can read! Nevertheless we welcome every new attempt to open the meaning of this book of books, which is plain enough to a child, and yet deep enough for the profoundest philosopher and the most comprehensive scholar.

EPOCHS OF EXEGESIS.

The Bible—and this is one of the many arguments for its divine character—has given rise to a greater number of discourses, essays, and commentaries, than any other book or class of books; and yet it is now as far from being exhausted as ever. The strongest and noblest minds, fathers, schoolmen, reformers, and modern critics and scholars of every nation of Christendom, have labored in these mines and brought forth precious ore, and yet they are as rich as ever, and hold out the same inducements of plentiful reward to new miners. The long line of commentators will never break off until faith shall be turned into vision, and the church militant transformed into the church triumphant in heaven.

Biblical exegesis, like every other branch of theological science, has its creative epochs and classical periods, followed by periods of comparative rest, when the results gained by the productive labor of the preceding generation are quietly digested and appropriated to the life of the church.

There are especially three such classical periods: the patristic, the reformatory, and the modern. The exegesis of the fathers, with the great names of Chrysostom and Theodoret of

the Greek, and Jerome and Augustine of the Latin Church, is essentially Catholic; the exegesis of the reformers, as laid down in the immortal biblical works of Luther and Melanchthon, Zwingli and Œcolampadius, Calvin and Beza, is Protestant; the modern exegesis of Germany, England, and America, may be called, in its best form and ruling spirit, Evangelical Catholic. It includes, however, a large variety of theological schools, as represented in the commentaries of Olshausen and Tholuck, Lücke and Bleek, Hengstenberg and Delitzsch, Ewald and Hupfeld, de Wette and Meyer, Lange and Stier, Alford and Ellicott, Stuart and Robinson, Hodge and Alexander, and many others still working with distinguished success. The modern Anglo-German exegesis is less dogmatical, confessional, and polemical than either of its predecessors, but more critical, free, and liberal, more thorough and accurate in all that pertains to philological and antiquarian research; and while it thankfully makes use of the labors of the fathers and reformers, it seems to open the avenue for new developments in the ever-expanding and deepening history of Christ's kingdom on earth.

The patristic exegesis is, to a large extent, the result of a victorious conflict of ancient Christianity with Ebionism, Gnosticism, Arianism, Pelagianism, and other radical heresies, which roused and stimulated the fathers to a vigorous investigation and defence of the truth as laid down in the Scriptures and believed by the Church. The exegesis of the reformers bears on every page the marks of the gigantic war with Romanism and its traditions of men. So the modern evangelical theology of Germany has grown up amidst the changing fortunes of a more than thirty years' war of Christianity with Rationalism and Pantheism. The future historian will represent this intellectual and spiritual conflict, which is not yet concluded, as one of the most important and interesting chapters in history, and as one of the most brilliant victories of faith over unbelief, of Christian truth over anti-Christian error. The German mind has never, since the Reformation, developed a more intense and persevering activity, both for and against the gospel, than in this period, and if it should fully overcome the modern and most powerful attacks upon Christianity, it will achieve as important a work as the Reformation of the sixteenth century. Former generations have studied the Bible with as much and perhaps more zeal, earnestness, and singleness of purpose, than the present. But never before has it been subjected to such thorough and extensive critical, philological, historical, and antiquarian, as well as theological investigation and research. Never before has it been assailed and defended with more learning, acumen, and perseverance. Never before has the critical apparatus been so ample or so easy of access · the most ancient manuscripts of the Bible having been newly discovered, as the Codex Sinaiticus, or more carefully compared and published (some of them in fac-simile), as the Codex Sinaiticus, Vaticanus, Alexandrinus, Ephraemi Syri, and the discoveries and researches of travellers, antiquarians, historians, and chronologers being made tributary to the science of the Book of books. No age has been so productive in commentaries on almost every part of the sacred canon, but more particularly on the Gospels, the Life of Christ, and the Epistles of the New Testament. It is very difficult to keep up with the progress of the German press in this department. One commentary follows another in rapid succession, and the best of them are constantly reappearing in new and improved editions, which render the old ones useless for critical purposes. Still the intense productivity of this period must sooner or later be exhausted, and give way to the more quiet activity of reproduction and application.*

* Even Dr. Wordsworth, who is disposed to find in the old Catholic and modern Anglican fathers the beginning and the end of exegetical knowledge and wisdom, feels constrained to admit (in the Preface to his Commentary on

The time has now arrived for the preparation of a comprehensive theological commentary which shall satisfy all the theoretical and practical demands of the evangelical ministry of the present generation, and serve as a complete exegetical library for constant reference: a commentary learned, yet popular, orthodox and sound, yet unsectarian, liberal and truly catholic in spirit and aim; combining with original research the most valuable results of the exegetical labors of the past and the present, and making them available for the practical use of ministers and the general good of the church. Such a commentary can be sucessfully wrought out only at such a fruitful period of Biblical research as the present, and by an association of experienced divines equally distinguished for ripe scholarship and sound piety, and fully competent to act as mediators between the severe science of the professorial chair and the practical duties of the pastoral office.

LANGE'S COMMENTARY.

Such a commentary is the *Bibelwerk* of Dr. LANGE, assisted by a number of distinguished evangelical divines and pulpit orators of Germany, Switzerland, and Holland.* This work was commenced in 1857, at the suggestion of the publishers, Velhagen and Klasing, in Bielefeld, Prussia, on a plan similar to that of STARKE's *Synopsis*, which appeared a hundred years ago, and has since been highly prized by ministers and theological students as a rich storehouse of exegetical and homiletical learning, but which is now very rare, and to a large extent antiquated.†

It is to embrace gradually the whole Old and New Testament. The Rev. Dr. John P. Lange, professor of evangelical theology in the University of Bonn, assumed the general editorial supervision; maturing the plan and preparing several parts himself (Matthew, Mark, John, Romans, and Genesis), selecting the assistants and assigning to them their share in the work. It is a very laborious and comprehensive undertaking, which requires a variety of talents, and many years of united labor. It is the greatest literary enterprise of the kind undertaken in the present century. HERZOG's *Theological Encyclopædia*, of which the eight-

the N. T., p. v.): "Indeed it must be confessed, with thankfulness to the Divine Author of the Scripture, that the present age enjoys, in certain respects, greater privileges for the due understanding of Holy Writ than were ever conferred by Almighty God on any preceding generation since the revival of letters." And he is candid enough to admit, also (on p. vi.), "that the palm for industry in this sacred field is especially due to another nation. The Masorites of the New Testament are from Germany."

* The full German title of this work is: THEOLOGISCH-HOMILETISCHES BIBELWERK. *Die Heilige Schrift Alten und Neuen Testaments mit Rücksicht auf das theologisch-homiletische Bedürfniss des pastoralen Amtes in Verbindung mit namhaften evangelischen Theologen bearbeitet und herausgegeben von* J. P. LANGE. Bielefeld. Verlag von Velhagen und Klasing, 1857 ff.

† SYNOPSIS BIBLIOTHECÆ EXEGETICÆ IN NOVUM TESTAMENTUM. *Kurzgefasster Auszug der gründlichsten und nutzbarsten Auslegungen über alle Bücher Neuen Testaments. In Tabellen, Erklärungen, Anmerkungen und Nutzanwendungen, mit Zuziehung des Grundtextes, und fleissiger Anführung der dabey gebrauchten Bücher, zum erwünschten Handbuch, etc. etc. Mit Beyhülfe einiger Gelehrten von* CHRISTOPH STARKE, *Pastore Primario und Garnison, Prediger der Stadt und Festung Driesen.* 3 vols. 4to. The preface is dated 1733. I have seen in this country and occasionally compared two copies of this work, one of the second edition, Leipzig, 1740 (in the Theol. Seminary Library at Mercersburg, Pa.), and one of the 4th ed., Leipz. 1758 (in possession of a German clergyman at New York). The first volume, containing the four Gospels, covers 2,523 closely printed quarto pages. The title of the Old Testament Part is: SYNOPSIS BIBLIOTHECÆ EXEGETICÆ IN VETUS TESTAMENTUM, etc., Berlin and Halle, 1741 ff. 6 vols. 4to. His son, Johann Georg Starke, completed the Old Testament. Christoph Starke was born A. D. 1684, was pastor primarius in the town and fortress Driesen, and died 1744. His motto was: *Crucem sumo, Christum sequor.* He was not a man of genius, like Lange, but of immense literary industry, and his work is a dry but useful compilation. He embodied in it extracts from previous exegetical works, especially those of Luther, Brentius, Canstein, Cramer, Hedinger, Lange, Majus, Osiander, Piscator, Quesnel, Tosanus, Biblia Wurtembergensia, Zeisius. Lange transfers the substance of Starke's labors to the homiletical sections of his Commentary, and credits him with the extracts from his predecessors under their names.

eenth volume has just been published (with two volumes of supplements still in prospect), is a similar monument of German learning and industry, and will be, for many years to come, a rich storehouse for theological students. So far the Commentary of Lange has progressed rapidly and steadily, and proved decidedly successful. Even in its present unfinished state, it has already met with a wider circulation than any modern commentary within the same time, and it grows in favor as it advances.

The following parts, of the New T., have been published, or are in course of preparation:

I. THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MATTHEW, with an *Introduction to the whole New Testament.* By Dr. JOHN P. LANGE, 1857. Second (third) edition revised, 1861.

II. THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MARK. By Dr. JOHN P. LANGE. Second edition revised, 1861.

III. THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO LUKE. By Dr. J. J. VAN OOSTERZEE, professor of theology at Utrecht. Second edition revised, 1861.

IV. THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO JOHN. By Dr. JOHN P. LANGE. Second edition, 1862.

V. THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES. By Prof. Dr. G. LECHLER, of Leipzig, and Dean K. GEROK, of Stuttgart. Second edition revised, 1862.

VI. THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS, now in course of preparation by the editor, in connection with his son-in-law, Rev. Mr. FAY, in Crefeld, who assumed the homiletical part.

VII. THE EPISTLES TO THE CORINTHIANS. By the Rev. Dr. CHR. FR. KLING, 1862.

VIII. THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS. By the Rev. OTTO SCHMOLLER, 1862.

IX. THE EPISTLES TO THE EPHESIANS, PHILIPPIANS, AND COLOSSIANS. By Prof. Dr. DAN. SCHENKEL, of Heidelberg, 1862.*

X. THE EPISTLES TO THE THESSALONIANS. By Prof. Drs. C. A. AUBERLEN and CHR. JOHN RIGGENBACH, of Basel, 1864.

XI. THE PASTORAL EPISTLES and THE EPISTLE TO PHILEMON. By Dr. J. J. VAN OOSTERZEE, of Utrecht. Second edition revised, 1864.

XII. THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS. By Prof. Dr. C. B. MOLL, 1861.

XIII. THE EPISTLE OF JAMES. By Prof. Drs. J. P. LANGE and J. J. VAN OOSTERZEE, 1862.

XIV. THE EPISTLES OF PETER and THE EPISTLE OF JUDE, by Dr. G. F. C. FRONMÜLLER. Second edition revised, 1861.

The remaining parts, of the N. T., containing THE EPISTLES OF JOHN, and THE REVELATION, have not yet appeared. Part VI. (on the Epistle to the Romans) and Part XV. are, however, in process of preparation, and may be expected within a year.

Of the Commentary on THE OLD TESTAMENT, one volume has just been published (1864), which contains a general Introduction to the whole Old Testament, and a commentary on Genesis by the editor.

According to a private letter of our esteemed friend, Dr. Lange, the following dispositions have already been made concerning the Old Testament:

DEUTERONOMY. By Rev. JUL. SCHRÖDER, of Elberfeld (successor of Dr. F. W. Krummacher as pastor, and author of an excellent practical commentary on Genesis).

JOSHUA. By Dr. PAULUS CASSEL, in Berlin.

* This part will probably be rewritten by another hand on account of the recent unfortunate change in the theological position of the author.

JUDGES. By Rev. Mr. SCHNEIDER, rector of the seminary at Bromberg.

KINGS. By Dr. BÄHR, in Carlsruhe (author of the celebrated work on the Symbolism of the Mosaic Worship, etc.).

THE PSALMS. By Dr. MOLL, general superintendent in Königsberg.

JEREMIAH. By Rev. Dr. NÄGELSBACH, of Bayreuth.

DR. LANGE.

The reader will naturally feel some curiosity about the personal history and character of the editor and manager of this great Biblical work, who heretofore has been less known among English readers than many German divines of far inferior talent. Only two of his many works have been brought out in an English dress, and they only quite recently, namely, his *Life of Jesus*, and parts of his Commentary on the Gospels.

Dr. Lange was born on the 10th of April, 1802, on the Bier, a small farm in the parish of Sonnborn, near Elberfeld, in Prussia. His father was a farmer and a wagoner, and brought his son up to the same occupation, but allowed him, at the same time, to indulge his passion for reading. Young Lange often drove the products of the soil to market. He early acquired an enthusiastic love of nature, which revealed to his poetic and pious mind, as in a mirror, the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven. He was instructed in the doctrines of the Heidelberg Catechism, which is still in use among the Reformed Churches on the Rhine, although the Lutheran and Reformed Confessions are united in Prussia since 1817 under one government and administration, and bear the name of the United Evangelical Church. His Latin teacher, the Rev. Herrmann Kalthof, who discovered in him unusual talents, induced him to study for the ministry. He attended the Gymnasium (College) of Düsseldorf from Easter, 1821, to autumn, 1822, and the University of Bonn from 1822 to 1825. There he studied mainly under Dr. Nitzsch, the most venerable of the living divines of Germany, who for many years was a strong pillar of evangelical theology in Bonn and subsequently in Berlin. The writings of Nitzsch, though pregnant with deep thoughts and suggestive hints, give but an imperfect idea of his power, which lies chiefly in his pure, earnest, and dignified, yet mild and amiable personal character. He is emphatically a *homo gravis*, a Protestant church-father, who, by his genius, learning, and piety, commands the respect of all theological schools and ecclesiastical parties.

After passing through the usual examination, Lange labored from 1825 to 1826 in the quiet but very pleasant town of Langenberg, near Elberfeld, as assistant minister to the Rev. Emil Krummacher (a brother of the celebrated Dr. Frederic William Krummacher, who wrote the sermons on Elijah the Tishbite, and other popular works). From thence he was called to the pastoral charge of Wald, near Solingen, where he remained from 1826 to 1828. In 1832 he removed as pastor to Duisburg, and began to attract public attention by a series of brilliant articles in Hengstenberg's Evangelical Church Gazette and other periodicals, also by poems, sermons, and a very able work on the history of the infancy of our Saviour, against Strauss's *Life of Jesus*. In 1841 he was called to the University of Zürich, in Switzerland, as professor of theology in the place of the notorious Strauss, who had been appointed by the radical and infidel administration of that Canton, but was prevented from taking possession of the chair by a religious and political revolution of the people. In Zürich he labored with great per-

severance and fidelity in the midst of many discouragements till 1854, when he received a call to the University of Bonn, in Prussia, where he will probably end his days on earth.*

Dr. Lange is undoubtedly one of the ablest and purest divines that Germany ever produced. He is a man of rare genius and varied culture, sanctified by deep piety, and devoted to the service of Christ. Personally he is a most amiable Christian gentleman, genial, affectionate, unassuming, simple, and unblemished in all the relations of life. He combines an unusual variety of gifts, and excels as a theologian, philosopher, poet, and preacher. He abounds in original ideas, and if not always convincing, he is always fresh, interesting, and stimulating. He is at home in the ideal heights and mystic depths of nature and revelation, and yet has a clear and keen eye for the actual and real world around him. He indulges in poetico-philosophical speculations, and at times soars high above the clouds and beyond the stars, to the spiritual and eternal "land of glory," on which he once wrote a fascinating book.† His style is fresh, vigorous, and often truly beautiful and sublime, but somewhat deficient in simplicity, clearness, and condensation, and is too much burdened with compound, semi-poetical, unwieldy epithets, which offer peculiar difficulties to the translator. His speculations and fancies cannot always stand the test of sober criticism, although we might wish them to be true. But they are far less numerous in his Commentary than in his former writings. They are, moreover, not only harmless, but suggestive and pious, and supply a lack in that sober, realistic, practical, prosaic common-sense theology which deals with facts and figures rather than the hidden causes and general principles of things, and never breathes the invigorating mountain air of pure thought.

Poetical divines of real genius are so rare that we should thank God for the few. Why should poetry, the highest and noblest of the arts, be banished from theology? Has not God joined them together in the first and last chapters of the Bible? Has He not identified poetry with the very birth of Christianity, in the angelic hymn, as well as with its ultimate triumphs, in the hallelujahs of the countless host of the redeemed? Is it not one of the greatest gifts of God to man, and an unfailing source of the purest and richest enjoyments? Is it not an essential element and ornament of divine worship? Can any one fully understand and explain the Book of Job, the Psalms and the Prophets, the Parables, and the Apocalypse, without a keen sense of the beautiful and sublime? Theology and philosophy, in their boldest flights and nearest approaches to the vision of truth, unconsciously burst forth in the festive language of poetry; and poetry itself, in its highest and noblest forms, is transformed into worship of Him who is the eternal source of the True, the Beautiful, and the Good. No one will deny this who is familiar with the writings of St. Augustine, especially his *Confessions*, where the metaphysical and devotional elements interpenetrate each other, where meditation ends in prayer, and speculation in adoration. But the greatest philosophers, too, not only Plato, Schelling, and Coleridge, who were constitutionally poetical, but even Aristotle, Kant, and Hegel, who were the greatest masters of pure reasoning and metaphysical abstraction, prove

* For the biographical notices I am indebted to the kindness of Dr. Lange, who communicated them to me by letter at my request. I previously wrote also a sketch of his character as a divine in my book on *Germany, its Universities and Divines*, Philadelphia, 1857, of which I have no copy on hand, the edition being exhausted. I have seen Dr. Lange in Zürich in 1844, and at Bonn in 1854, and corresponded with him more or less for the last twenty years.

† Under the title: *Das Land der Herrlichkeit, oder die christliche Lehre vom Himmel*, first published as a series of articles in Hengstenberg's *Evangelical Church Gazette*, and then in book form, 1838. Dr. H. Harbaugh, of Mercersburg, Pa., has translated a portion of it in the third of his three popular works on the heavenly world, which have gone through some fifteen or twenty editions.

this essential harmony of truth and beauty.* The poetic and imaginative element imparts freshness to thought, and turns even the sandy desert of dry critical research into a blooming flower garden. I fully admit, of course, that the theologian must regulate his philosophical speculations by the word of revelation, and control his poetic imagination by sound reason and judgment. Lange represents, among German divines, in hopeful anticipation, the peaceful and festive harmony of theology and poetry, of truth and beauty, which exists now in heaven, "the land of glory," and will be actualized on the new earth. Take the following striking passage on the locality and beauty of heaven, as a characteristic specimen of his thought and style: †

"When the beautiful in the world manifests itself alone, so that the friendly features of God's character are exclusively seen, profane souls remain profanely inclined; yea, they become even more profligate in the misuse of the riches of God's goodness. If, on the other hand, the greatness and power of God are revealed in the rugged and terribly sublime, in the hurricane, in the ocean-storm, then the profane are overwhelmed with horror, which is easily changed into fear, and may manifest itself in hypocritical or superficial exhibitions of penitence; but when the goodness and power of God manifest themselves in one and the same bright phenomenon, this produces a frame of spirit which speaks of that which is holy. This is the reason why the much-praised valley of the Rhine is so solemn and sabbatic, because it is enamelled by a blending of the beautiful and the sublime: stern mountains, rugged rocks, ruins of the past, vestiges of grandeur, monumental columns of God's power, and these columns at the same time garlanded with the loving wreaths of God's favor and goodness, in the midst of smiling vineyards which repose sweetly around in the mild sunlight of heaven. For this reason the starry night is so instructive—the grandest dome decked with the brightest radiance of kindness and love. For the same reason there is such magic attraction in the morning dawn and in the evening twilight: they take hold upon us like movings to prayer; because in them beauty is so mingled with holy rest, with spiritual mystery, with the earnest and sublime. Thus does it meet the festive children of this world, who are generally of a prayerless spirit, so that they are as it were prostrated upon the earth in deep devotion, when some great sight in nature, in which the beautiful is clothed with sublime earnestness, bursts upon their view; or when, on the other hand, some marked manifestation of God's power is associated with heart-moving wooings of kindness. Accordingly, we hear one tell what pious emotions he felt stirring his bosom, when he beheld the wide-extended country from the top of the Pyrenees; another tells how the spirit of prayer seized upon his soul when he stood upon the height of Caucasus, and felt, as he looked over the eastern fields and valleys of Asia, as if heaven had opened itself before him. Such witnesses might be gathered to almost any extent.

"But now it is certain that there must be SOME PLACE in the upper worlds where the beauties and wonders of God's works are illuminated to the highest transparency by his power and holy majesty; where the combination of lovely manifestations, as seen from radiant summits, the enraptured gaze into the quiet valleys of universal creation, and the streams of light which flow through them, must move the spirits of the blest in the mightiest manner, to cry out: HOLY! HOLY! HOLY!—And there is the holiest place in the great Temple! It is there, because there divine manifestations fill all spirits with a feeling of his holiness. But still rather, because there he reveals himself through holy spirits, and through the holiest one of all, even Jesus Himself!"

Dr. Lange's theology is essentially biblical and evangelical catholic, and inspired by a fresh and refreshing enthusiasm for truth under all its types and aspects. It is more positive and decided than that of Neander or Tholuck, yet more liberal and conciliatory than the orthodoxy of Hengstenberg, which is often harsh and repulsive. Lange is one of the most uncompromising opponents of German rationalism and scepticism, and makes no concessions to the modern attacks on the gospel history. But he always states his views with moderation, and in a Christian and amiable spirit; and he endeavors to spiritualize and idealize doctrines

* I would mention as examples that noble passage of Aristotle on nature's argument for the existence of God, preserved by Cicero, *De Nat. Deorum*, ii. 37, and quoted by Alexander von Humboldt with admiration, in his *Kosmos*, vol. ii. p. 16 (German edition), a work where otherwise even the name of God is nowhere mentioned; Kant's famous saying of the two things which fill his soul with ever-growing reverence and awe, the starry heaven above him, and the moral law within him; and Hegel's truly sublime introduction to his *Lectures on the Philosophy of Religion*, as well as many of the noblest passages in his *Lectures on Æsthetics*.

† From his youthful work: *Das Land der Herrlichkeit*. Not having a copy of the original within reach, I borrow the translation from Dr. Harbaugh's *Heavenly Home*, ch. vii. p. 142 ff.

and facts, and thus to make them more plausible to enlightened reason. His orthodoxy, it is true, is not the fixed, exclusive orthodoxy either of the old Lutheran, or of the old Calvinistic Confession, but it belongs to that recent evangelical type which arose in conflict with modern infidelity, and going back to the Reformation and the still higher and purer fountain of primitive Christianity as it came from the hands of Christ and His inspired apostles, aims to unite the true elements of the Reformed and Lutheran Confessions, and on this firm historical basis to promote catholic unity and harmony among the conflicting branches of Christ's Church. It is evangelical catholic, churchly, yet unsectarian, conservative, yet progressive; it is the truly living theology of the age. It is this very theology which, for the last ten or twenty years, has been transplanted in multiplying translations to the soil of other Protestant countries, which has made a deep and lasting impression on the French, Dutch, and especially on the English and American mind. It is this theology which is now undergoing a process of naturalization and amalgamation in the United States, which will here be united with the religious fervor, the sound, strong common sense, and free, practical energy of the Anglo-American race, and which in this modified form has a wider field of usefulness before it in this new world than even in its European fatherland.

Dr. Lange is an amazingly fertile author. Several of his works belong to the department of belle-lettres, æsthetics, and hymnology. Some of his hymns have deservedly found a place in modern German hymn books,* and help to swell the devotions of the sanctuary. His principal works on theological subjects are, first, a complete system of Divinity, in three parts, severally entitled: *Philosophical Dogmatics*, *Positive Dogmatics*, and *Applied Dogmatics* (or *Polemics* and *Irenics*). This is an exceedingly able work, abounding in original and profound ideas, but artificial and complicated in its arrangement, often transcending the boundaries of logic, and in many sections almost untranslatable. His second great work is a *Life of Jesus*, also in three parts, which, upon the whole, is justly regarded as the fullest and ablest modern work on the subject, and the best positive refutation of Strauss. It has quite recently been given to the English public by Mr. Clark, in six volumes.† His *History of the Apostolic Church*, in two volumes, was intended as the beginning of a general History of Christianity, which, however, has not been continued. But the last, the most important, and the most useful labor, worthy to crown such a useful life, is his *Theological and Homiletical Commentary*. All his preceding labors, especially those on the Life of Christ, prepared him admirably for the exposition of the Gospels, which contains the rich harvest of the best years of his manhood. This Commentary will probably engage his time for several years to come, and will make his name as familiar in England and America as it is in Germany.

I add a complete list of all the published works of Dr. Lange, including his poetry, in chronological order:

1. *Die Lehre der heiligen Schrift von der freien und allgemeinen Gnade Gottes.* Elberfeld, 1831.
2. *Biblische Dichtungen.* 1 Bändchen. Elberfeld, 1832.
3. *Predigten.* München, 1833.
4. *Biblische Dichtungen.* 2 Bändchen. Elberfeld, 1834.

* I adopted a number of them in my German hymn book, published in 1859 and extensively used in this country, *e. g.*, Nos. 94, 194, 227.

† The Life of the Lord Jesus Christ: *a complete critical examination of the Origin, Contents, and Connection of the Gospels. Translated from the German of* J. P. Lange, D.D. *Edited, with additional Notes, by the Rev. Marcus Dods, A.M., in 6 vols.* Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1864. Vol. i. is translated by Sophia Taylor, vol. ii. by J. E. Ryland, vol. iii. by M. G. Huxtable, vol. iv. by Rev. Rob. E. Wallis, vol. v. by Rev. S Manson, vol. vi. by Rev. Robert

5. *Kleine polemische Gedichte.* Duisburg, 1835.
6. *Gedichte und Sprüche aus dem Gebiete christlicher Naturbetrachtung.* Duisburg, 1835.
7. *Die Welt des Herrn in didaktischen Gesängen.* Essen, 1835.
8. *Die Verfinsterung der Welt. Lehrgedicht.* Berlin, 1838.
9. *Grundzüge der urchristlichen frohen Botschaft.* Duisburg, 1839.
10. *Homilien über Colosser* iii. 1–17. Vierte Auflage. Bremen, 1844,
11. *Christliche Betrachtungen über zusammenhängende biblische Abschnitte für die häusliche Erbauung* Duisburg, 1841.
12. *Ueber den geschichtlichen Charakter der kanonischen Evangelien, insbesondere der Kindheitsgeschichte Jesu, mit Beziehung auf das Leben Jesu von D. F. Strauss.* Duisburg, 1836.
13. *Das Land der Herrlichkeit, oder die christliche Lehre vom Himmel.* Mörs, 1838.
14. *Vermischte Schriften*, 4 Bände. Mörs, 1840–'41.
15. *Gedichte.* Essen, 1843.
16. *Die kirchliche Hymnologie, oder die Lehre vom Kirchengesang. Theoretische Einleitung und Kirchenliederbuch.* Zürich, 1843.
17. *Das Leben Jesu*, 3 Bücher. Heidelberg, 1844–'47.
18. *Worte der Abwehr (in Beziehung auf das Leben Jesu).* Zürich, 1846.
19. *Christliche Dogmatik*, 3 Bände. *Philosophische*, *Positive*, und *Angewandte Dogmatik.* Heidelberg, 1847.
20. *Ueber die Neugestaltung des Verhältnisses zwischen dem Staat und der Kirche.* Heidelberg, 1848.
21. *Neutestamentliche Zeitgedichte.* Frankfurt a. M., 1849.
22. *Briefe eines communistischen Propheten.* Breslau, 1850.
23. *Göthe's religiöse Poesie.* Breslau, 1850.
24. *Die Geschichte der Kirche*, Erster Theil. *Das apostolische Zeitalter*, 2 Bände. Braunschweig, 1853–'54.
25. *Auswahl von Gast-und Gelegenheitspredigten.* Zweite Ausgabe. Bonn, 1857.
26. *Vom Oelberge. Geistliche Dichtungen.* Neue Ausgabe. Frankfurt a. M., 1858.
27. *Vermischte Schriften. Neue Folge*, 2 Bändchen. Bielefeld, 1860.
28. *Theologisch-homiletisches Bibelwerk*, commenced 1857, Bielefeld. Dr. Lange prepared the Commentaries on Matthew, 3d edition, 1861; on Mark, 2d edition, 1861; on John, 2d edition, 1862; on the Epistle of James (in connection with van Oosterzee), 1862; on Genesis, with a general introduction to the Old Testament, 1864; on the Epistle to the Romans (now in course of publication).

THE PLAN OF LANGE'S COMMENTARY.

The plan of Lange's *Bibelwerk* is very comprehensive. It aims to give all that the minister and Biblical student can desire in one work. Its value consists to a great extent in its completeness and exhaustiveness, and in the convenient arrangement for practical use.

It contains, first, appropriate INTRODUCTIONS, both critical and homiletical, to the Bible as a whole, to each particular book, and to each section. The sections are provided with clear and full headings, the parallel passages, and the indications of their homiletical use in the order of the church year.

The TEXT is given, not in the original Greek, nor in Luther's version, but in a *new German version*, which is as literal as the genius of the language will bear, and is made with special reference to the exposition. The principal readings of the Greek text are given in foot-notes, with short critical remarks. The critical editions of the Greek Testament by Lachmann and Tischendorf* are made the basis.

Smith. Six translators for one of the many books of Lange! This is a sufficient evidence of the difficulty of the task. The editor (Mr. Dods), in the introductory preface to vol. i., speaks in the highest terms of "this comprehensive and masterly work." I am very happy to find that Lange, who has been comparatively unknown out of Germany, is beginning to be appreciated in England. The frequent references to the *Leben Jesu* in this Commentary on Matthew are always to the German original; the translation having reached me too late to change the figures. It is not likely, however, that such a voluminous and costly work will be soon reprinted in America; the less so, since the author has embodied many of the most important results in his Commentaries on Matthew, Mark, and John.

* Not, however, the seventh and best edition of Tischendorf, which appeared in 1859, two years after the first edition of Lange's Matthew, and which often deviates from the text of his previous editions and returns to many of the

Then follows the Commentary itself. This is threefold, CRITICAL, DOCTRINAL, and HOMILETICAL.* The three departments are kept distinct throughout, and are arranged under different heads, so that the reader can at once find what he wants at the time, without being forced to work his way through a mass of irrelevant matter.

1. The first department contains: EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL NOTES.† These explain the words and phrases of the text, and endeavor to clear up every difficulty which presents itself to the critical student, according to the principles of grammatico-historical exegesis. On all the more important passages, the different views of the leading ancient and modern commentators are given; yet without the show and pedantry of learning. The chief aim is to condense, in as brief a space as possible, the most valuable and permanent results of original and previous exegetical labors, without detaining the reader with the tedious process of investigation, and a constant polemical reference to false opinions. The building appears in its beautiful finish, and the scaffolding and rubbish required during its construction are removed out of sight.

2. The second department is headed: LEADING DOGMATICAL AND ETHICAL THOUGHTS, or DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.‡ It presents, under a number of distinct heads, the fundamental doctrines and moral maxims contained in, or suggested by, the text. In the Gospels, these truths and principles are viewed mainly from the christological point of view, or as connected with the person and work of our Saviour. The reader will find here a vast amount of living theology, fresh from the fountain of God's revelation in Christ, and free from scholastic and sectarian complications and distortions. The person of Christ stands out everywhere as the great central sun of truth and holiness, from which light and life emanate upon all parts of the Christian system.

3. The third department is entitled: HOMILETICAL HINTS or SUGGESTIONS.§ This shows the way from the study to the pulpit, from the exposition and understanding of the word of God to its practical application to all classes and conditions of society. It is especially the pastor's department, designed to aid him in preparing sermons and Biblical lectures, yet by no means to supersede the labor of pulpit preparation. It is suggestive and stimulating in its character, and exhibits the endless variety and applicability of Scripture history and Scripture truth. It brings the marble slabs from the quarry, and the metals from the mine, but leaves

readings of the *textus receptus*. This is the case in the Gospel of Matthew alone in more than a hundred places, *e. g.*, Matt. ii. 13; iii. 1; iv. 23; v. 11, 18, 32; vi. 5, 16, 33; vii. 14; viii. 10, 13; ix. 1, 8, 9, 11, 17; x. 7, 10, 14, 19, 23, 33, etc.

* The proper rendering of the German headings of the three distinct sections, viz., EXEGETISCHE ERLÆUTERUNGEN, DOGMATISCH-CHRISTOLOGISCHE or (in the Acts and Epistles) DOGMATISCH-ETHISCHE GRUNDGEDANKEN, and HOMILETISCHE ANDEUTUNGEN, has given some trouble. The Edinburgh translation of Matthew renders them: CRITICAL NOTES, DOCTRINAL REFLECTIONS, and HOMILETICAL HINTS. But this is too free, and the edition alluded to is not consistent. The Scotch translator of the Commentary on the Acts, of which the first twelve chapters have just appeared, Rev. Paton J. Gloag, renders the headings more literally: EXEGETICAL EXPLANATIONS, DOGMATICAL AND ETHICAL THOUGHTS, HOMILETICAL HINTS. But *Grundgedanken* means *fundamental* or *leading* thoughts. Upon the whole I thought it most advisable to use the adjectives only, as best calculated to reconcile conflicting tastes and opinions. *Christologico-Dogmatical*, and *Dogmatico-Ethical* would be too heavy, while *Doctrinal and Ethical* is good English and gives the idea as well. For symmetry's sake I chose a double adjective for the other sections: 1. EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL; 2. DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL; 3. HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

† In German: EXEGETISCHE ERLÆUTERUNGEN, lit.: EXEGETICAL ILLUSTRATIONS or EXPLANATIONS (which is somewhat tautological, *exegetical* being identical with *expository* or *explanatory*).

‡ In German: DOGMATISCH-ETHISCHE GRUNDGEDANKEN. In the Gospels, where the christological element preponderates, Lange calls them: DOGMATISCH-CHRISTOLOGISCHE GRUNDGEDANKEN. But his contributors have substituted for it the more general title: DOGMATICO-ETHICAL FUNDAMENTAL THOUGHTS, which is as applicable to the respective sections in the Gospels as to those in the Epistles. In his Commentary on Genesis, just published (1864), Dr. Lange uses THEOLOGISCHE GRUNDGEDANKEN.

§ HOMILETISCHE ANDEUTUNGEN.

the chiselling and hammering to the artist. The authors of the several parts give under this heading first their own homiletical and practical reflections, themes and parts in a few words, and then judicious selections from other homiletical commentators, as QUESNEL, CANSTEIN, STARKE, GOSSNER, LISCO, OTTO VON GERLACH, HEUBNER, and occasionally brief skeletons of celebrated sermons.

I must confess, I was at first prejudiced against this part of the Commentary, fearing that it made the work of the preacher too easy; but upon closer examination I became convinced of its great value. If I am not mistaken, the American readers will prize it in proportion as they make themselves familiar with it. They will be especially edified, I think, by the exuberant riches and high-toned spirituality which characterize the homiletical suggestions of Lange, and several of his contributors, especially Dr. van Oosterzee (a man of genius, and the best pulpit orator of Holland), as also with the selections from Starke and his predecessors found under his name, Otto von Gerlach (late court-preacher in Berlin, and author of a brief popular commentary), and the venerable Heubner (late director of the Theological Seminary at Wittenberg).

There are standard commentaries on special portions of the Scriptures, which excel all others, either in a philological or theological or practical point of view, either in brevity and condensation or in fulness of detail, either in orthodoxy of doctrine and soundness of judgment or in expository skill and fertility of adaptation, or in some other particular aspect. But, upon the whole, the Biblical work of Dr. Lange and his associates is the richest, the soundest, and the most useful general commentary which Germany ever produced, and far better adapted than any other to meet the wants of the various evangelical denominations of the English tongue. This is not only my individual opinion, but the deliberate judgment of some of the best Biblical and German scholars of America whom I have had occasion to consult on the subject.

THE ANGLO-AMERICAN EDITION.

A work of such sterling value cannot be long confined to the land of its birth. America, as it is made up of descendants from all countries, nations, and churches of Europe (*e pluribus unum*), is set upon appropriating all important literary treasures of the old world, especially those which promise to promote the moral and religious welfare of the race.

Soon after the appearance of the first volume of Dr. Lange's Commentary, I formed, at the solicitation of a few esteemed friends, and with the full consent of Dr. Lange himself, an association for an American edition, and in September, 1860, I made the necessary arrangements with my friend, Mr. Charles Scribner, as publisher.* The secession of the slave States, and

* I may be permitted to state that I went into this enterprise at first with considerable reluctance, partly from a sense of its vast labor and responsibility, partly because it involved in all probability the abandonment of an original, though much shorter commentary (German and English) which I had been preparing for the last twenty years, and of which a few specimens appeared in the *Kirchenfreund* (1848–'53) and in the *Mercersburg Review*. But the task seemed to devolve on me naturally and providentially, and I gradually became so interested in it that I am willing to sacrifice to it other cherished literary projects. Dr. Lange himself, in forwarding to me an early copy of the first volume, wished me to take part in the original work, and encouraged me afterward to assume the editorial supervision of the English translation, giving me every liberty as regards additions and improvements. I made, however no use of my old notes on Matthew, leaving all my exegetical manuscripts boxed up with my library at Mercersburg. I did not wish to mix two works which differ in plan and extent, and adapted my additions to the general character and plan of Lange's work and the wants of the English reader.

the consequent outbreak of the civil war in 1861, paralyzed the book trade, and indefinitely suspended the enterprise. But in 1863 it was resumed at the suggestion of the publisher, and with the consent of Mr. T. Clark, of Edinburgh, who in the mean time (since 1861) had commenced to publish translations of parts of Lange's Commentary in his "Foreign Theological Library." * I moved to New York for the purpose of devoting myself more fully to this work amid the literary facilities of the city, completed the first volume, and made arrangements with leading Biblical and German scholars of different evangelical denominations for the translation of the other volumes.

The following books are already finished, or in course of preparation for the press:

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MATTHEW, with a *General Introduction to the New Testament.* By the American EDITOR.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MARK. By the Rev. Dr. W. G. T. SHEDD, Professor of Biblical Literature in the Union Theological Seminary at New York.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO LUKE. By the EDITOR.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO JOHN. By the Rev. Dr. EDWARD D. YEOMANS, of Rochester, N. Y.

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES. By the Rev. Dr. CHARLES F. SCHÄFFER, Professor in the Evangelical Lutheran Seminary at Philadelphia.

THE EPISTLES TO THE CORINTHIANS. By the Rev. Dr. DANIEL W. POOR, of Newark, N. J.

THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS. By the Rev. CHARLES C. STARBUCK, New York.

THE EPISTLES TO THE PHILIPPIANS, and that TO PHILEMON. By Prof. H. B. HACKETT, Newton Centre, Mass.

THE EPISTLES TO THE THESSALONIANS. By the Rev. Dr. JOHN LILLIE, of Kingston, N. Y.

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS. By the Rev. Dr. A. KENDRICK, Professor in Rochester University, N. Y.

THE CATHOLIC EPISTLES. By the Rev. J. ISIDOR MOMBERT, of Lancaster, Pa.

These gentlemen, and others who are or will be invited to take part in the work, have already an established reputation as excellent Biblical scholars or experienced translators from the German, and will no doubt do full justice to the task assigned them.

It is impossible beforehand to state with absolute certainty the number of volumes or the time required for the completion of the whole commentary. It is sufficient to say that it will be energetically pushed forward, without undue haste, and published with proper regard to economy of space and price. The enterprise is necessarily a very extensive and expensive one, and falls in a most unfavorable period of the American book trade; the war having caused an unprecedented rise in the price of composition, paper, and binding material. But it has the advantage over an encyclopædia and other voluminous works, that each volume will cover an entire book or books of the Bible and thus be relatively complete in itself, and can be sold separately.

PRINCIPLES OF THE AMERICAN EDITION.

The character of the proposed Anglo-American edition of Lange's *Bibelwerk*, and its relation to the original, may be seen from the following general principles and rules on which it will be prepared, and to which all contributors must conform, to insure unity and symmetry.

* Mr. Clark has issued the first three Gospels and a portion of the Acts, but I understand that he does not intend at present to prosecute the enterprise.

1. The Biblical Commentary of Dr. Lange and his associates must be faithfully and freely translated into idiomatic English, without omission or alteration.*

2. The translator is authorized to make, within reasonable limits, such additions, original or selected, as will increase the value and interest of the work, and adapt it more fully to the wants of the English and American student. But he must carefully distinguish these additions from the original text by brackets and the initials of his name, or the mark *Tr.*

3. The authorized English version of 1611, according to the present standard edition of the American Bible Society,† must be made the basis, instead of giving a new translation, which, in this case, would have to be a translation of a translation. But wherever the text can be more clearly or accurately rendered, according to the present state of textual criticism and biblical learning, or where the translation and the commentary of the German original require it, the improvements should be inserted in the text (in brackets, with or without the Greek, as the writer may deem best in each case) and justified in the Critical Notes below the text, with such references to older and recent English and other versions as seem to be necessary or desirable.

4. The various readings are not to be put in foot-notes, as in the original, but to follow immediately after the text in small type, in numerical order, and with references to the verses to which they belong.

5. The three parts of the commentary are to be called: I. Exegetical and Critical; II. Doctrinal and Ethical; III. Homiletical and Practical.

6. The Exegetical Notes are not to be numbered consecutively, as in the original, but marked by the figure indicating the verse to which they belong; an arrangement which facilitates the reference, and better accords with usage.‡

7. Within these limits each contributor has full liberty, and assumes the entire literary responsibility of his part of the work.

If these general principles are faithfully carried out, the American edition will be not only a complete translation, but an enlarged adaptation and improvement of the original work, giving it an Anglo-German character, and a wider field of usefulness.

The typographical arrangement will be closely conformed to the original, as upon the whole the best in a work of such dimensions. A page of the translation contains even more than a page of the original, and while the size of volumes will be enlarged, their number will be lessened.

THE COMMENTARY ON MATTHEW.

The first volume which is now issued, will show these principles and rules in their actual execution, and may therefore serve as a specimen for the volumes that will follow.

As regards the translation of this part of the commentary, I must acknowledge my indebt-

* A condensation, such as has been proposed by some in this case, opens the door for an endless variety of conflicting opinions and tastes, and almost necessarily results in a mutilation of the original. The only proper alternative seems to be either to translate a foreign work entire, if it be at all worthy of translation, or to make it the basis of a new work.

† Not the revision of 1854 (which contained unauthorized changes and was set aside), but the collation adopted by the Board of Managers in 1858, and printed in 1860 and since. See the *Report of the Committee on Versions to the Board of Managers of the American Bible Society*, for February, 1859.

‡ I would remark, that all the changes and improvements above proposed have the hearty approval of Dr. Lange. The last one he has since adopted himself in his recent Commentary on Genesis.

edness to the Edinburgh translation of the Rev. ALFRED EDERSHEIM and the Rev. W. B. POPE, which I used to a large extent as a basis, especially in the earlier chapters, comparing it word for word with the original.* But I found it necessary to make innumerable alterations and additions, so that this may be regarded almost as a new work. There is not a page and hardly a sentence in the Edinburgh translation, so far as I used it at all, which remained untouched. I have no disposition to criticise it in detail, or to injure any of the useful publications of my esteemed friend, Mr. Clark, who has done more than any other publisher for transplanting German learning on British soil, and is entitled to the lasting gratitude of English and American divines. But I must say that, while some portions of the Edinburgh translation are well executed, especially if we take into consideration the peculiar difficulties of Lange's style and thought, it is very unequal and imperfect: it omits, besides the improvements of the second and third editions of the original, without a word of explanation, all the critical foot-notes and various readings of the text, the changes in the English version, even where they are imperatively demanded by Lange's German version or comments, all the liturgical and most of the literary references of the work, and abounds in mistakes and mistranslations, some of which pervert the sense of the original into the very opposite, and suggest the charitable supposition that the nominal translators employed in part other and inferior hands in the execution of their laborious and difficult task.†

But I confined myself by no means to a thorough revision and completion of the Edinburgh translation. The American edition contains over one hundred pages, mostly in the smallest type, that is, fully one fourth, more matter than the German original (which numbers 462 pages). The additions are found mostly in the department of textual criticism, the revision of the English version, and in the comments on the later chapters of the Gospel.‡

It seemed to me worthy of the labor and trouble to make an attempt, on a somewhat larger scale than Dr. Lange, to popularize so much of the immense critical apparatus of modern biblical learning as can be made available for the practical use of ministers and students. A few words of explanation on the principles which guided us, may not be out of place here.

The great variety of readings in the Greek Testament is a fact which should stimulate investigation and strengthen our faith. All these discrepancies in the few uncial and the more than five hundred cursive manuscripts of the N. T. are unable to unsettle a single doctrine or precept of Christianity, and strengthen the evidence of the essential purity and integrity of the sacred text, showing that it has been substantially the same in all ages and countries in which those manuscripts were written. "If there had been," said Richard Bentley, the great classical scholar and critic, more than a hundred years ago, "but one manuscript of the Greek Testament at the restoration of learning, then we had had no various readings at all. And would the text be in a better condition then, than now we have 30,000 (50,000)? So far from that,

* The Edinburgh translation was made from the first edition of Lange, and appeared in small octavo, large type, uniform with "Clark's Foreign Theological Library," Third series, vols. ix. ff., under the title: *Theological and Homiletical Commentary on the Gospel of St. Matthew. From the German of J. P. Lange, D.D. By the Rev. Alfred Edersheim, Ph. D.*, vol. i., Edinburgh, 1861; vol. ii. and part of vol. iii., 1862. From a note on the back to the title page of vol. ii. it appears that the *Rev. W. B. Pope* translated from ch. xx. 28 to the close of the second volume. The third volume, which contains the conclusion of Matthew and the Gospel of Mark, appears without the name of a translator. According to this plan, the whole Commentary of Lange on the N. T. would require at least thirty volumes of Mr. Clark's "Library."

† I have occasionally pointed out some of the omissions and errors of the Edinburgh edition, where they furnished occasion for additional explanations. *See e. g.* pp. 31, 37, 367, 389, 394, 396, 445, 511, 531, 533, 550.

‡ Compare pp. 18, 33, 34, 121, 180 f., 203–208, 228, 239, 256–260, 267, 293–297, 339, 353 f., 351 f., 449, 454–458, 467 f. 471–475, 519–522, 555–566, etc.

that in the best single copy extant we should have hundreds of faults, and some omissions irreparable. Besides that, the suspicions of fraud and foul play would have been increased immensely. It is good, therefore, to have more anchors than one. . . . It is a good providence and a great blessing that so many manuscripts of the New Testament are still amongst us, some procured from Egypt, others from Asia, others found in the Western Churches. For the very distances of places, as well as numbers of the books, demonstrate that there could be no collusion, no altering nor interpolating one copy by another, nor all by any of them. In profane authors whereof one manuscript only had the luck to be preserved, as Velleius Paterculus among the Latins, and Hesychius among the Greeks, the faults of the scribes are found so numerous, and the defects so beyond all redress, that; notwithstanding the pains of the learnedest and acutest critics for two whole centuries, those books still are, and are like to continue, a mere heap of errors. On the contrary, where the copies of any author are numerous, though the various readings always increase in proportion, there the text, by an accurate collation of them, made by skilful and judicious hands, is ever the more correct, and comes nearer to the true words of the author."

The object of biblical criticism is to restore the oldest and purest text which can be obtained with our present means and facilities. In accordance with the well-known principle first propounded by Bentley, revived by the venerable Bengel, and recently applied and carried out by Lachmann, we must make the oldest and most authoritative uncial manuscripts of the New Testament now extant the basis of the true text, especially those few which date from the fourth to the sixth century. They are the following: 1. Codex Sinaiticus, edited by Tischendorf, Leipz., 1863.* 2. Cod. Vaticanus (designated by the letter B., defective from Heb. ix. 14), carelessly edited by Cardinal Angelo Mai, with improvements by Vercellone, Rome, 1857, and much better by Philip Buttmann, Berlin, 1862. 3. Cod. Alexandrinus (A., in the British Museum), of which the New Testament was published in uncial types, though not in fac-simile, by C. G. Woide, Lond., 1786, and by B. H. Cowper, 1860. 4. Cod. (rescriptus) Ephraemi Syri (C., a cod. rescriptus, or palimpsest, very imperfect), published by Tischendorf, in uncial type, but not in fac-simile, Leipz., 1843. 5. Cod. Bezæ (D., at Cambridge), containing the Gospels and the Acts, with a Latin version, published in fac-simile by Ths. Kipling, Camb., 1793, 2 vols., fol.† In the same class with these oldest manuscripts,

* Dr. Lange could not make use of this very important discovery, which will hereafter figure largely in the critical apparatus of future editions of the Greek Testament, although it will not materially disturb the principles and results of modern criticism. Tischendorf (*Prolegg.*, p. xxx. sqq.) regards the Sinaitic MS., which he was so fortunate as to discover on Mount Sinai, and which he published under the liberal patronage of the Russian government, as the oldest copy extant, older even than the famous Vatican MS., and Bäumlein, Meyer and Wieseler agree, while Hilgenfeld objects. It is moreover the only complete uncial MS., and contains the whole Bible of the O. and N. T. Compare the *Addenda* at the close of this volume. The Sinaitic Bible generally agrees with Codd. B., D., L., T. (T. is Codex Borgianus, at Rome, of the fifth century, and contains only a few fragments, John vi.-viii.), X. (Codex Monacensis, parts of the four Gospels), Z. (Dublinensis, a palimpsest, the greater part of Matthew), over against Cod. A. (Alexandrinus) and the great majority of later uncial and cursive manuscripts, while Cod. C. (Ephraemi Syri) occupies a position of its own. With all its great value the Sinaitic Manuscript abounds in blunders owing to the ignorance and carelessness of the transcriber. This shows the great importance of the vast number and variety of manuscripts of the Bible, which far exceeds in amount that of any other ancient book in the world. Comp. Wieseler on the Sinait. MS., in the *Studien und Kritiken* for 1864, p. 399.

† I was so fortunate as to have access, in the Library of the American Bible Union of New York, to the printed editions of these important manuscripts, which are far preferable to the imperfect collations of former critics, and the mere references often faulty in the apparatus of Greek Testaments. For fuller information on these and other Codices I must refer the reader to the ample *Prolegomena* of Tischendorf to his seventh critical edition of the N. T., 1859, and to his edition of Cod. Sinaiticus, 1863; also to the *Prolegomena* of Alford, *Commentary*, vol. i., 4th ed. 1859, ch. vii., p. 102 ff., and to Scrivener's *Introduction to the Criticism of the N. T.*, 1861.

though last, must be placed the later and less important uncials, as Cod. BASILIENSIS (called E., of the eighth or ninth century, containing the Gospels), Cod. BOREELI (F., at Utrecht, the Gospels, except some portions of Matthew and Mark), Cod. SEIDELII HARLEIANUS (G., in the British Museum, the greater part of the Gospels), Codd. H., I., K., L. (Paris, No. 62, generally in agreement with Codd. Sin. and Vatic.), etc. Next in importance to the uncial manuscripts are the quotations of the early fathers, and the ancient versions, especially the Latin and the Syriac. In the third rank are to be placed the cursive manuscripts of later date, down to the close of the fifteenth century, of which more than five hundred have been collated in the Gospels alone. For our purpose it was useless to refer to them except in those rare cases where the older authorities are insufficient to establish the original text. The decision of the true reading depends, however, not only on the antiquity and number of authorities, but also on internal reasons. Lachmann's object was simply historical, viz., to establish the oldest attainable text, as it stood in the fourth or fifth century, in the place of the comparatively recent, accidental, and unreliable *textus receptus*. This is the only safe basis for future critics, but it is only a part of the task, which must be completed by a proper consideration of the internal evidences. Where the oldest authorities—uncial manuscripts, patristic quotations, and ancient versions—lead to no satisfactory result, later manuscripts (which may be transcripts of uncial manuscripts even older than those we now possess) may be profitably consulted, and that reading deserves the preference which gives the best sense and agrees most with the style and usage of the writer. Thus, in many instances, a return from Lachmann to the *textus receptus* may be justified. *See* the seventh critical edition of Tischendorf.

As to the corrections of the authorized English version, I beg the reader to view them as part of the commentary. Some of them would be unnecessary or even objectionable in a revised version for public use. Our incomparable English Bible stands in no need of a radical revision; its idiom, beauty, and vigor are all that can be desired. But no good scholar will deny that it might be greatly improved as to clearness and accuracy; while many doubt whether it could be done without producing greater division and confusion, and thus doing more harm than good. A final revision for popular use should proceed from a body of scholars representing the British and American Bible Societies, and all the Protestant Churches which worship God in the English language, and have an equal claim to this inestimable inheritance of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In the mean time, no one can object to new translations and revisions for exegetical and critical use. They prepare the way for a final authorized revision for general and popular use.

My selections from other writers are mostly taken from representative older and modern commentators of the various English and American Churches, with the view to give this work an *Anglo*-German character. Thus Burkitt, M. Henry, Scott, and Doddridge represent the older practical exegesis of England; Alford and Wordsworth, the modern Anglican exegesis in its two divergent, progressive, and conservative, tendencies; D. Brown, the Free Church of Scotland; Addison J. Alexander, the Old School Presbyterian; Barnes and Owen, the New School Presbyterian; Whedon and Nast, the Methodist; Conant, the Baptist views on the more important doctrinal passages in the Gospel of Matthew.

I cannot conclude this lengthy preface without giving public expression to my sense of gratitude to the officers of the "American Bible Union," for the unrestricted use of their valuable Biblical Library, with its rich variety of Bibles in all languages, commentaries,

dictionaries, the Benedictine and other editions of the church fathers, etc., which make it probably the best collection of the kind on this continent.

May the blessing of the triune God rest upon this commentary on His holy word, which was commenced in faith and with the earnest desire to assist the ministers of the Gospel in the discharge of their high and holy mission.

PHILIP SCHAFF.

BIBLE HOUSE, NEW YORK, *Oct.* 31*st*, 1864.

/

THEOLOGICAL AND HOMILETICAL INTRODUCTION

TO

THE NEW TESTAMENT.

§ 1. THEOLOGY in general, or the scientific knowledge of the Christian religion, may, according to its historical and scientific character, be arranged under two great divisions,—Historical, and Theoretical or Systematic Theology, taking these terms in their widest sense. (I.) Historical Theology may again be ranged under the following three sections:—(1) The History of Revelation, or of the Kingdom of God, which forms the basis of the whole system; (2) The History of the Records of Revelation, or Exegetics in the wider sense; (3) The History of Revealed Religion, or Church History. (II.) In the same manner, Theoretical or Systematic Theology may be divided into three sections:—(1) The System of Christian Doctrines, or Dogmatics; (2) The System of Christian Morals, or Ethics; (3) The System of Christian Polity, or Practical Theology.

§ 2. From this analysis we infer that the materials from which to construct a theological and homiletical Introduction to the Sacred Scriptures, must be derived from the elements of the history of revelation, of exegesis, and church history, as well as from the elements of dogmatics, ethics, and practical theology, always with special reference to the practical, homiletical, and pastoral point of view.

§ 3. Before proceeding with our special Introduction to the New Testament, we must premise, in brief outline, a General Introduction to the Scriptures. The special introduction to the Old Testament may be left for another occasion,* not merely because our present task is connected with the New Testament, but because, as Christians, we proceed, theoretically, from the New Testament to the Old, and not *vice versa*. It is sufficient for our purpose to communicate, in briefest form, the results obtained by modern research, and to indicate the works which may aid the reader in reviewing these results for himself.

§ 4. Accordingly, we shall have to preface the N. T. portion of our Commentary,—(1) by a General Introduction from the theological and homiletical point of view; (2) by a Historical and Exegetical Introduction to the New Testament in general, and to its various parts; (3) by a General Homiletical and Pastoral Introduction; (4) by a Homiletical and Pastoral Introduction to the New Testament.

* [The Theol. and Homil. Commentary on the Old Testament which is included in the plan of Dr. Lange's *Bibelwerk*, and will follow that on the New T.—P. S.]

FIRST SECTION.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION TO THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

§ 1.

THE HISTORY OF REVELATION, OR OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

THE History of the Kingdom of God must not be confounded with Biblical History. The latter, like Biblical Theology, forms part of Exegesis, while the History of the Kingdom of God embraces the whole history of the world viewed from the Christian stand-point.

The kingdom of God is that new creation in which God reveals Himself in His character as Redeemer. It is based upon the universal and absolute dominion of God over the world, and results from it; and it consists in the restoration of the dominion of the Spirit of God over the hearts of men, brought about by Christ, who is the heart of the race. As mankind was originally destined to form the kingdom of God, and for that purpose was arranged into one family, the kingdom of God may also be viewed as the restoration of mankind to one body under the One and Eternal Head (Acts iii. 21; Eph. i. 22), in whom it was elected from all eternity, and called, for the harmonious manifestation of the glory of God (Eph. i. 4, 5).

The restoration of this kingdom presupposes the existence of an opposite pseudo-kingdom, in which the human family were scattered and dispersed by sin—a kingdom of darkness and of falsehood, the kingdom of Satan. Accordingly, the history of the preparation, foundation, and completion of the kingdom of God, is at the same time the history of its hostile conflicts with the antagonistic kingdom of darkness.

The kingdom of God disappeared from earth through the working of unbelief, by which the Lord was robbed of His dominion over the heart. Similarly has it again been restored to the world by the combined operation of the grace of God, and of a spiritual faith which He has planted in the heart of His elect, and which ultimately appeared in all its fulness and perfectness, as conquering the world, in Christ, the Elect One. This salvation of the world is destined gradually to spread till it pervades all mankind. Hence the extension of the kingdom of God to its final completion in the world will occupy the entire *course of time*, even as this kingdom is destined to cover *all space* in the world. Viewed in this light, the whole history of the world itself is simply the history of the restoration and transformation of the world into the kingdom of God.

Thus, all history may be included under the idea of the βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ. But its innermost centre is that manifestation of God's redeeming grace, by which, on the basis of His general revelation to man, He has founded His kingdom.

The all-comprehensive medium of God's revelation was His personal incarnation in Christ. Throughout the entire course of history, we perceive how mankind, in ever-narrowing circles, tends towards this manifestation of the God-Man. Again, after He has appeared, we notice how, in ever-widening circles, it tends towards the final goal—to present all mankind as born of God.

Christ, then, is the beginning, the middle, and the end of all revelation. But as revelation is ever love, light, and life, it embodies at the same time both saving truth and saving reality, or revelation in the narrower sense, and actual redemption. Hence it is that in Christ we have not only the completion of revelation, but also complete redemption.

Redemption, in all its phases and stages, is prepared and introduced by judgments, which, by the grace of God, are, however, converted into so many deliverances. Again, every new stage in the unfolding and history of salvation is marked by a fresh extension and establishment of the kingdom of God, appearing as the Church of the redeemed. Hence, while the real kingdom of God was founded when redemption was first introduced, it shall be perfected when the benefits of redemption shall have been extended to the utmost boundaries of the world.

This is the *Development of Revelation*, to which we now proceed.

I. *General Revelation.*

a) *Widest* circle (revelation by Symbolical signs, which ultimately point to the Word).

1. Objectively: creation (Rom. i. 20).
2. Subjectively: the human mind, especially the conscience (Rom. ii. 14, 15).

b) *Narrower* circle (revelation by facts).

1. Objectively: history (Ps. ii., cx.).
2. Subjectively: the dealings of God with individuals (Ps. cvii.; cxxxix. 16).

II. *Special Revelation, or Revelation of Salvation* (by the Word, accompanied by Symbolical Signs).

a) Revelation during the course of its *progress*.

1. Objectively: the Old Covenant (Gen. xii. etc.).
2. Subjectively: faith (Gen. xv. 6).

b) Revelation *completed*.

1. Objectively: the New Covenant (Luke xxii. 20; John xiii. 34).
2. Subjectively: justifying faith, in its New Testament sense (Rom. v. 1; 1 Pet. iii. 21).

So far as we are concerned, it is by subjective revelation that we become partakers of objective revelation, even as it is only by the revelation of salvation that we come to understand and see general revelation. The various cycles of revelation are clearly perceived only when viewed in the light of justifying and saving faith, which sheds upon each of them a new and glorious lustre.

The following are the various *periods* of historical revelation in parallel review:—

The **Old Testament** in the wider sense of the term:	The **New Testament** in the wider sense of the term:
1. Primeval religion, unto Abraham, 2000 B. C.	1. Gospel history, and the Apostolic Age.
2. Patriarchal faith in the promise, unto 1500 B. C.	2. The ancient Catholic Church. The Fathers.
3. The period of the Law, unto 800 B. C.	3. The legal Church of the Middle Ages. [The Popes.—P. S.]
4. The period of the Prophets, unto 400 B. C.	4. The Protestant Churches. [The Reformers.—P. S.]
5. The period of national religiousness (the Maccabees).	5. Union into one evangelical Church in its *progress*.
6. Concentration of religious longing in the ancient world as the cradle of the Messiah. The Blessed Virgin.	6. The Bride of Christ, or the Church in the last days awaiting His coming.
7. The first coming of Christ.	7. The last coming of Christ. His manifestation in glory.

The manifestation of salvation, as it constitutes the great moving force of all history, draws the course of the latter into the whole of the history of the kingdom of God. The history of the βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ may be divided into that of the Kingdom of God in its legal and typical form, or the Theocracy (a term formed by Josephus, *Contra Apion.* ii. 16), and that of the real Kingdom of God in spirit and in truth—the βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν,—or into the Pre-Christian and the Christian (not *Post*-Christian) Era.

I. *History of the Theocracy, or of the Pre-Christian Era.*

1. Primeval times, the type of the entire history of the world to the great judgment—till the Flood—and the new formation of the (Noachic) race.

2. The dispersion of nations and the calling of Abraham; or, origin of the contrast between Heathenism and Judaism (preparation for the Theocracy), or between passive and active religiousness (the religions of nature, and that of revelation).

a) The table of nations in Genesis, and the mythologies of the Gentiles.

b) Separation between the civilized nations of antiquity and barbarous tribes (Heathenism in its ascending and in its descending line. *See* Rom. ii.).

a) Promise of the holy people.

b) Separation between Isaac and Ishmael, Jacob and Esau. Difference among the sons of Israel (Judaism in its ascending and in its descending line. Rom. ii. and x.).

3. Establishment of the great contrast; or, the Empires of the world as the central points of civilization, and the foundation and history of the Theocracy in the narrower sense. Antagonism and mutual influence.

a) Great Empires of the world in their origin and growth. Egypt, Assyria, Phœnicia, etc.

b) The great Empires of the world fully developed.—Dan. ii. Vision of the image of the various monarchies. Its bright aspect: Union. Dan. vii. Vision of the four beasts. Its dark aspect: Division.

α) The Babylonian Empire.

β) The Persian Empire.

γ) The Macedonian Empire.

δ) The Roman Empire.

a) The Theocracy in its origin. Antagonism and mutual influence between Israel, and Egypt, Canaan, Syria, Phœnicia, and Assyria.

b) The Theocracy in its full typical manifestation.

Antagonism and mutual influence between Israel and the four Empires.

α) Period of the Judge sand Prophets, from Moses to David.

β) Period of the Kings, from David to the Babylonian Exile.

γ) Period of the Priests (blooming period under the Maccabees).

δ) Close of the typical and commencement of the real kingdom of God.

4. Removal of the great contrast and antagonism. Gentiles settle in Palestine; the Jews of the Diaspora. Cessation of the typical, and preparation of the real Theocracy. (Heathen power and heathen culture. Oppression of the Jews and prophecies.)

a) The Cuthæans settled in Samaria, and becoming Samaritans.

b) The Aramæan language and Sadducean notions introduced into Palestine on the return from Babylon.

c) The Decapolis in Galilee of the Gentiles, founded chiefly by the veterans of Alexander the Great.

d) The Herodians. Introduction of Grecian and Roman manners in Palestine. (The Proselytes.)

a) The ten tribes carried to Assyria beyond the Euphrates.

b) Many of the Jews remaining in Babylon.

c) Jewish colonies in Alexandria, Libya, Syria, and Asia Minor. The Septuagint.

d) The Jewish Diaspora in Rome and throughout the West, since the time of Pompey and Cæsar. (The Essenes.)

e) Rule of the heathen, of Christians, and of Mohammedans in Palestine.

e) Destruction of Jerusalem, and dispersion of the people throughout the world.

5. The first coming of Christ. Close of the first, and commencement of the second era. Redemption of the world.

II. *History of the Kingdom of God in its Fulness, or of the Kingdom of Heaven in the World.*

1. Primeval Christianity, the type of all Church History.

2. Appearance of the antagonism between the Christian Church and the Jewish and heathen world.

a) The Talmud, and heathen calumnies against Christianity.
b) Judaism in its unhistorical ossification. (Analogy with the partial barbarism of the original races.)

a) The ancient Catholic Church and the martyrs.
b) Separation between the Church and heretical sects.

3. Establishment of this antagonism; or, the Christian Empires, and the establishment of the Church in the narrower sense. Hostility and mutual influences. Mediæval Legalism a symbol and type of the future.

a) Movement in the heathen world.
b) Secularization of the Church.
c) Migration of the nations into the Church, and the great baptism of water.
d) The Eastern Church, or orthodoxy secularized.
e) Mohammedanism, or heresy completed.
f) The Western Papacy.
g) The Catholic Roman Empire. The anti-evangelical powers. Machiavellianism.

a) The worldly Church of Constantine the Great. Missions.
b) The Monastic Church.
c) The Theocratic legalistic Church.
d) The Roman Church.
e) Western Catholic Christendom. The Crusades.
f) Protestant parties and movements during the Middle Ages. Humanism. Popular literature.
g) Evangelical Christendom. Germ of the true Church and the true State.

4. Removal of the antagonism, and appearance of the true Church and the true State.

a) The Roman Catholic world.
b) The reformatory movements in the Roman Catholic Church.
c) The dissolving elements of Jesuitical Monasticism, Mysticism, political influences, and the advance of civilization in Romish Churches and countries, under the form of reaction.
d) Revolutions in the Roman Catholic world.
e) The world in all forms of intellectual heathenism acting upon the Church.
f) Humanism as leaven in the Roman Catholic and in Romanizing Churches.

a) The Church of the Reformation (harmonious difference between Church and State).
b) Romanizing divisions of the Evangelical Church.
c) Awakenings and union among Protestants.
d) Protestant Reforms.
e) Christian missions acting upon all parts of the world.
f) The authority of Christ appearing in all departments of life. The Bible the book of nations.

5. The future of Christendom.

a) Apostasy in the alliance between Absolutism and Antichrist.
b) Judgment upon the apparent completion of Hierarchism and Secularism.

a) Victory in the union of believers under the banner of Christ.
b) Redemption of the visible Church of Christ in its apparent destruction. Manifestation of the Bride, and advent of the Bridegroom.

LITERATURE.

In a certain sense, every branch of literature may be regarded as auxiliary to the study of the history of the kingdom of God. More particularly, however, we include here those works on universal history which are written from a general or a

religious point of view, and works on the philosophy of history. It is scarcely necessary to add, that we would also direct special attention to historical books written in a Christian spirit, and to those which treat expressly of the history of the kingdom of God.

I. General Works*.

On *Chronology*:—Gatterer (1777), Ideler (1825–26), Brinkmeier (1843). On *General History*:—Herder, Fred. Schlegel (R. C.), and Hegel, on the *Philosophy of History*. Eyth: *History from the Christian stand-point* (1853). Ehrenfeuchter: *The Histor. Development of Mankind* (Heidelb. 1855). Bräm, Barth, Lisco, Theremin, Grundtwig, Zahn, Kalkar, Ziegler, Kurtz, on *Sacred History*. Bunsen: *God in History* (Part I. Leipz., 1857). Leo (Romanizing), and Dittmar: *History of the World before and since Christ*. [R. Turnbull: *Christ in History*. Boston, 1854.—P. S.]

II. On Particular Periods and Branches.

1. **History of Creation.**—Schubert, Wagner, Pfaff, Burmeister (negative), Rougemont. Humboldt: *Kosmos*. Kurtz: *Bible and Astronomy* (Germ. and English). [Hugh Miller: *Testimony of the Rocks, or Geology in its bearings on the two theologies, natural and revealed*. Edinb. and Boston, 1859. Tayler Lewis: *The Six Days of Creation, or the Scriptural Cosmology*. New York and London, 1855.—P. S.]

2. **The Flood.**—Lücken, Stolberg (*Hist. of Religion*, Germ., vol. i. App.), Buttmann, Bopp (*Die Sündfluth*, Berlin, 1829), Rud. Wagner (*Naturgeschichte des Menschen*, 1838), Schubert (*Das Weltgebäude*, Erlangen, 1852).

3. **The Division of Nations and the Genealogical Table. Heathenism.**—Feldhoff (*Die Völkertafel der Genesis*, 1837), Knobel (ditto, 1850). [Tuch, Delitzsch, Bush, *on Genesis*, ch. x.—P. S.] Creuzer, Baur, Stuhr, Wuttke, *on Ancient Mythology and the heathen religions*. G. Seibert: *Griechenthum und Christenthum*, 1857. Döllinger (R. C.): *Heidenthum und Judenthum—Vorhalle des Christenthums*, 1857. [A very learned and instructive work, also translated into English.—P. S.] Schelling: *Philosophy of Mythology*.

4. **History of Israel.**—Hess, Jost (a liberal Jew), Bertheau, Ewald, [Milman, Stanley] *on the history of the Jews*.—Comp. Josephus *on the Jewish war*.

5. **Fulfilment of Prophecies.**—Keith, O. Strauss (*Niniveh and the Word of God*, 1855), Layard (*Nineveh and Babylon*).

6. **The Life of Christ.**—Works of Hase, Neander, Lange, Ewald, Lichtenstein, Friedlieb, Bucher, [Sepp, Kuhn, Ellicott, Andrews, *on the Life of Christ;* also Ullmann, Young, Bushnell, Schaff, Dorner, *on the Character and sinless Perfection of Jesus*.—P. S.]

7. **The Apostolic Age.**—Neander, J. P. Lange (Leipz., 1853), P. Schaff (2d ed., Leipz., 1854, German and English), Thiersch, Trautmann, Lechler, *on the Apostolic Age*. Mosheim, Baur, Hagenbach and Schaff, *on the Church in the first three centuries*.

8. **Church History.**—*See* Liter. in Hagenbach's *Theol. Encyclop.*, p. 220, and in Schaff's *Hist. of the Apost. Church*, Gen. Introd., ch. iv. On the moral effects of Christianity: Tzschirner, *on the Downfall of heathenism* (German), Chastel, Beugnot, on the same subject (French), C. Schmidt: *Essai historique sur la société civile dans le monde romain, et sur sa transformation par le Christianisme;* [comp. an able review of the latter work, by Dr. Sears, in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for April, 1863.—P. S.]

9. **Post-Christian Judaism.** — Friedländer, Grätz, Beer, M'Caul, Jost, [Edersheim,] *on later Jewish history*.

10. **Mohammedanism.**—G. Weil: *Mohammed, his Life and Doctrine* (German). Stuttgart, 1843. Döllinger: *Mohammed's Religion*. München, 1838. W. Irving: *Life of Mohammed*. Gerok: *Christology of the Koran* (German). Gotha, 1839. German translations of the *Koran*, by Boysen, Wahl, Geiger, Ullmann. [Engl. trsl. with notes, by J. M. Rodwell. London, 1861.—P. S.]

11. **History of Civilization.**—A very extensive literature. *General* works on the subject by Gruber, Kolb, Wachsmuth (Leipz. 1850), Guizot [Balmez.] History of *Philosophy* by Brucker, Tennemann, Reinhold, Rixner, Ritter, Hegel, Sigwart, Schwegler; and *on special sections* of the hist. of Philos.: Brandis, Erdmann, Chalybäus [Zeller, Morell, A. Butler, Maurice.—P. S.] History of *Art* by Kugler, Schnaase, Otte, Springer, Piper, etc. History of *Literature* by Eichhorn, Wachler, Bouterweck, Schlegel, [Grässe, Brunet, Allibone, etc.] History of *Law* and *Jurisprudence* by Eichhorn, Walter, Philipps, Grimm, Savigny.

12. **History of Missions.**—Blumhardt: *Gen. Hist. of Missions in the Christ. Church*. Basel, 1828–1837, 3 vols. G. Schmidt: *Victory of Christianity*, etc. (German). Leipz., 1857, 3d ed. Steger:

* [This long list of books is reduced in the Edinb. trsl. to a few lines, without division of subjects.—P. S.]

Protest. Missions, 1838. W. Hoffmann: *Missions-Stunden*, and other writings. Wallmann: *The Missions of the Evangel. Churches* (German), 1849. [Harvey Newcomb: *Cyclopedia of Missions* (700 pages). New York, 1854. The *Memorial Volume of the first Fifty Years of the Amer. Board of Com. for Foreign Missions.* Boston, 1861.—P. S.] The periodical reports and publications of Missionary societies in Europe and America. On *Inner* missions see the works of Wichern, März, [and the reports of the *German Church Diet and Congress for Inner Missions*, since 1848.—P. S.]

§ 2.

THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

I. *Auxiliary Sciences.*

Among the auxiliary sciences of exegesis we include all those which serve to prepare us for the study of Scripture. To this class belongs the study of antiquities, and that of ancient languages, generally; and, more particularly, that of criticism and of hermeneutics. The direct auxiliaries to the study of the Scriptures are, so far as the text itself is concerned, biblical antiquities and the sacred languages; and, so far as regards the present form of the text, biblical criticism and hermeneutics. These two sciences consist in the knowledge how scientifically to examine and to ascertain the genuineness of the records of Scripture and of the text, and in acquaintanceship with the fundamental principles of biblical interpretation.

1. **Biblical Archæology in general.**—Comp. Hagenbach, *Theol. Encyclop.*, p. 132. Among works on this subject we name those by Warnekros, Rosenmüller, Jahn, de Wette, Ewald, Scholz, Saalschütz, the *Real-Wörterbuch* of Winer (indispensable), and other Encyclopædias of Biblical Literature.

Various branches of biblical Archæology.

a) *Ethnology.*—The descendants of Shem. The Hebrews. The Jews. The nations of Canaan. The nations surrounding Israel. Comp. the Archæological works of Bellermann, Rosenmüller, Winer, Movers (*on the Phœnicians*), [Layard, Rawlinson, and Niebuhr *on the Assyrians.*]

b) *Geography.*—*Palestine* and the other countries mentioned in the Bible. Travels. Topographical works. Maps. Comp. especially Crome, von Raumer, Robinson (*Researches*, Engl. and Germ.), Strauss (*Sinai und Golgatha*), Krafft (*Topography of Jerusalem*), Schulz (*Jerusalem*), Tobler; the *Travels* of Berggren, Schubert, Robinson, Wilson, Van de Velde, Schulz, Tischendorf, [Stanley, Hackett, Thomson, Bausman,] etc.

c) *Natural Science.*—Bochart's *Hierozoicon.*

d) *Chronology.*—Comp. as above, p. 6.

e) *Civilization.*—Agriculture. Pastoral life. Dwellings. Furniture. Trades. Domestic life. Social life (Poetry and Music). Government. Theocracy. *See* Michaelis, *The Laws of Moses;* Herder and Saalschütz (*on Hebrew Poetry*); [the various commentaries of Ewald, Hupfeld, Umbreit, Hengstenberg, Delitzsch, Alexander, etc., etc., *on the Psalms* and other poetical books of the O. T.—P. S.]

f) *Religion.*—On the typology of the Old Testament services, comp. the works of Bähr (*Symbolik des Mos. Cultus*, 2 vols. 1837), Kurtz, Hengstenberg, Keil, [and Fairbairn, *Typology of Scriptures*, Edinb. and Philad., 1857.]

2. **The Languages of Scripture.**—*Philologia sacra. See* Hagenbach, p. 123, and the manuals quoted below.

3. **Biblical Criticism.**—Unhappily, we are still without any accurately defined canon of criticism, especially of biblical criticism. Hence, when biblical criticism appears in so many instances to be self-contradictory and self-destructive, this must be ascribed not merely to Rationalism, but also to the want of well-ascertained scientific principles. The two great points which must be kept in view in criticism are, the *authenticity* of the text, and its *integrity*. On the character and literature of biblical criticism, *see* Hagenbach, p. 146.—Fundamental principles: (1) The place of criticism is not above the subject, as looking down upon it, but in juxtaposition to, and in living contact with it. (2) In criticism we must progress from the general to the particular, in order to be always sure that we are treating of the same subject; while, on the other hand, we must also pass from the particular to the general, in order thereby to make sure of the reality and actuality of the subject. (3) The standard which we apply to a subject must be commensurate to it. Thus historical facts cannot be judged of by the physical standard applied to them by Pantheism and by Fatalism. Mythological ideas are altogether inapplicable to the

elucidation of the Scriptures. The Old Testament standard is insufficient for the criticism of the Gospel history. (4) The critic must first have settled his general principles before he can arrive at any conclusion as to the special results of these principles. Above all, therefore, he must be quite clear about the personality of God and of the God-Man. (5) Criticism must ever recognize it that all history has a deep religious bearing, symbolical of the great fact that all history has an ideal object, and that this grand idea is evolved in the course of history. (6) The critic must bear in mind that one grand idea pervades and connects the various portions of Scripture, while he at the same time keeps in view the gradual development of Scripture, its various periods, and the special form which each separate portion has taken, according to the individuality of the writer. (7) Criticism must be able to distinguish between agreement in spirit, and agreement in the letter merely. (8) The criticism of the witnesses themselves must precede the criticism of what they witnessed. (9) The various records of Scripture must be classified according to their relation to the character and object of those who bore the record. (10) The great fact that the Word has become flesh—*i.e.*, that the idea has become history—must be laid down as the fundamental principle of all criticism. This presupposition raises the critic above all false presuppositions. *See* Lange, *Leben Jesu*, i. 108; *Posit. Dogm.*, p. 605.

On the history of criticism, *see* Hagenbach, *Theol. Encyclop.*, p. 157, sqq.

4. **Biblical Hermeneutics.**—This is the science of the right understanding and the right interpretation of Holy Writ. For further explanation, and for the literature of the subject, *see* Hagenbach, p. 162. Among modern writers on hermeneutics, we mention Lücke, Clausen, Schleiermacher, Lutz, and the writer of the article *Hermeneutics* in Herzog's (German) *Real-Encycl.*; [also Cellerier: *Manuel d'Herméneutique*, Geneva, 1852; Fairbairn: *Hermeneutical Manual*, Philad. 1859.—P. S.] For the history of scriptural interpretation, and of its principles, we refer to the work of G. W. Meyer (*Hist. of Exegesis since the revival of Letters* (Gött., 1802—1808, 5 vols.). On the allegorical exegesis of the Middle Ages, *see* Elster: *De medii ævi theologia exegetica*, Gött., 1855.

The following are the essential conditions in hermeneutics:

a. For the right understanding.

(1.) Inward condition of interpretation: homogeneousness of spirit with the writer and his subject.

(2.) Outward condition: familiarity with the languages, antiquities, and history.

(3.) Combination of these two elements: familiarity with the peculiar character and spirit of revelation, and, in consequence, ability to distinguish between what is symbolical and mere myths, and again, between what is symbolical and what is pure history or abstract dogma. (The symbolical must not be confounded with myths; but, on the other hand, it must not be regarded as pure dogma.)

(4.) The mind of the interpreter must continually connect and bring into juxtaposition the Scriptures, in their general bearing, with the individual portions under examination. (Scripture must not be made to contradict itself by pressing the letter.) Analogy of faith: survey of the grand total bearing, the fundamental idea. Analogy of Scripture: survey of the individual and the special parts. Comparison of Scripture with Scripture.

(5.) A comparison and connection between the general spirit of Scripture, and the personal and individual views of each inspired writer.

(6.) A lively interchange between the mind of the Word and the mind of the interpreter.

(7.) A living interchange between the individual interpreter and the general spirit of interpretation in the Church. (Not, indeed, blind submission to authority, but neither craving for singularity.)

b. For the proper interpretation.

(1.) Accurate exposition of the meaning of the text. Interpretation in the narrower sense.

(2.) Illustration of the meaning of the text, by analogous passages. Explanation.

(3.) Reproduction of the meaning of the text, by pointing out its eternal bearing and import. Application.

II. *Exegetics.*

Exegetics, in the widest sense, depends on the proper connection between the right understanding and interpretation of the general import of Scripture and that of its individual portions. The parts can neither be understood without the whole, nor the whole without the parts. Hence that interpreter only can advance the subject who has learned to view the individual parts in the light of the total bearing of Scripture, and the total bearing in the light of the individual portions thereof. Thus alone can the necessary equilibrium be preserved.

Viewed theoretically, criticism is the first process, although, in point of practice, criticism follows upon exegetics and hermeneutics.

Criticism consists in a lively interchange between a scrutiny of the general principle and that of the individual statements of Scripture.

Hermeneutics then shows the lively interchange existing between the interpretation of the spirit, or of the meaning of Scripture as a whole, and the interpretation of the special passage or expression.

Lastly, we have *Exegetics* proper, which may be either general or special. The former, or Introduction (Isagogics), establishes and explains, from the mutual relationship between the character of Scripture as historically ascertained, and the summary contents of its various portions, the import and substance of the Scriptures generally. Special Exegetics develops and exhibits the succession of thought in Scripture, down to the minutest expression and letter, by connecting and comparing the ascertained character of Scripture with the text under review. The Introduction to the various books of Scripture belongs to the department of Exegesis, since, on the one hand, it presupposes an exegetical analysis of each book, while, on the other, it concludes with an exegetical survey of the contents of the portion of Scripture examined. Again, Exegesis itself is an Introduction, in the most special sense of the term. For every exegetical treatise must not only commence with a special introduction to, and indicate the character and contents of, the portion of Scripture about to be examined, but it must ever again revert to those general views and leading characteristics which have been ascertained.

1. Definition of the Holy Scriptures.

Holy Scripture is the complete sum of the records of our divinely revealed religion, which culminates in Christianity. Hence it marks the progress of the incarnation of the Eternal Word of God to its completion in the final settlement of the canon of Scripture. If, generally speaking, writing is the peculiar organ of civilization, the medium for the increasing interchange of thought, the record of the history of mankind, the standard of its development, all this applies in the highest, and, indeed, in a unique sense, to the sacred writings. They are the form under which Christianity originally appeared to regenerate the world, the bond of fellowship between believers of all nations and ages, the record of the history of revelation, and the standard and rule for the development of Christianity and of the Church.

In the all-wise arrangement of the God of revelation, Holy Writ was therefore as necessary as the Incarnation itself. The Gospel was destined to pervade every relationship of life and every institution. As in Baptism, it sanctified the washing with water; in the Eucharist, the meal of fellowship—the bread and the wine; and by the Charismata, the diversity of human gifts, so as a written record it sanctified the letter and assumed this essential form of intellectual and spiritual intercourse among men.

Bretschneider: * "The Bible may be viewed,—1, *historically*, if we inquire what its character is, according to the testimony of history—viz., a collection of credible documents of the Jewish and the Christian religion; or, 2, *dogmatically*, if we inquire in what light the religious society of Christians regard it—viz., as the code of Divine revelation." While at one time theologians were wont to lay special emphasis on the *dogmatical*, they have of late equally dwelt upon the *historical* character of Scripture. But all such seeming antagonism disappears if we take a deeper view of Holy Writ. Scripture is not "*a* collection," it is *the* collection. The various records of which it is composed, together form only *one* record. Lastly, the great question which claims our attention is not merely concerning the records of the Jewish and Christian religion generally, but as to the Divine origin and institution of these religions.

LITERATURE.—Comp. the article *Bible* in the different Encyclopædias of Ersch and Gruber, Herzog, Hagenbach, Pelt, [Kitto, Smith.—P. S.]. The different *Introductions* to the Old and New Testament (*see* a list of them in Winer's *Handbuch der theol. Literatur*, vol. i, p. 33 sqq.). Also the introductory chapters of the Bible-works of Starke, Richter, Gerlach, Lisco, Bunsen. Then the articles on the Holy Scriptures in the principal works on *Dogmatics*. Köppen: *Die Bibel*, 2 vols. Finally the modern works on *Biblical Theology*. On the *History* of the Bible, *see* E. Reuss (Braunschweig, 2d ed., 1853), and the more popular works of Ostertag: *Die Bibel und ihre Geschichte*, (2d ed., Basel, 1857), and Tholuck: *Die Bibel* (Leipzig, 1851). [Prideaux, Stackhouse, Howel, L. Clarke, on the *History of the Bible;* A. Alexander, and L. Gaussen, on the *Canon of the Old and New Testaments*.—P. S.]

2. Various Designations of the Scriptures.

The three different designations commonly given to the Scriptures indicate the different points from which the same Divine record may be viewed. The term BIBLE (τὰ βιβλία sc. θεῖα), i. e. *the* Book, or the Book of books, points out the difference between Holy Writ and all other literature, while at the same time it also connects the Scriptures with the intellectual productions of men. All other writings are, like planets, to move round this central sun. The name HOLY SCRIPTURE (ἱερὰ γραφή, ἁγία γραφή, θεῖα γραφή) refers to the relationship between the form or the letter of the Scriptures and the inspired word of God which it contains. Lastly, the term WORD OF GOD (Verbum Dei) indicates the identity of the oral revelation of God with the Bible, and also its internal identity—the agreement of the whole with the parts, and of the parts with the whole. The Bible, as such, is the historical object of theological science, the introduction to the Old and New Testament. The Bible, in its character as the Holy Scriptures, is the human expression of Divine inspiration, and the religious object of our faith. The Bible, as the Word of God, is the canon or the doctrinal rule and standard of our belief and practice. The first of these names designates the human aspect of Scripture in its Divine grandeur; the second, the combination of Divine revelation with human development and intellectuality;

* *Systemat. Entwicklung aller in der Dogmatik vorkommenden Begriffe.*

while the third points to the pure and perfect revelation of God which it embodies, or the canon, as the final and grand leading characteristic of the Bible, both as a book and as the Scriptures.

3. The Bible in its Divine Aspect. Inspiration. The Word of God.

The Bible consists of a number of books, whose composition is coextensive with the progress of Divine revelation in Israel, and covers a period of more than one thousand five hundred years. Its writers were of the most different character and education; it exhibits every variety of form, and is couched in two very different languages. Yet withal it is so thoroughly one in its character, that it might be supposed to have been written in one century, in one year, in one hour, in one moment.

Throughout, it is pervaded by one and the same idea of God and revealed religion; it sets forth the same truths; it breathes the same spirit; it has the same object. This is its *Divine* aspect. The Bible is not of time, nor of man; it is Divine, because it is inspired (2 Tim. iii. 16; 2 Pet. i. 20, 21).

But the inspiration of the Scriptures by the Spirit of God must not be viewed apart from the inspiration of the holy men who wrote it, in the execution of their immediate, prophetic, and Divine calling. Nay, the inspiration for their office has this advantage over the inspiration of their writings, which are closely connected, that it is more direct and more lively. On the other hand, the inspiration of these writings implies special preparedness and collectedness on the part of the sacred writers, and a special significance of the occasion and the motive. In all these respects a corresponding measure of spiritual blessing and direction must have been vouchsafed.

It is for didactic theology to enter into fuller details. The following points, however, should be borne in mind:—The idea of inspiration entertained by the Jews of Palestine was different from that of the Jews of Alexandria. The former accurately distinguished between Divine illumination and mere human enlightenment (hence the difference as to the Apocrypha). Besides, the views of the Palestinians were also sounder and more liberal on the question of the relation between the Divine Spirit and the intellect of man in inspiration. The Alexandrian Jews, following in this respect Grecian ideas, were wont to regard inspiration as something magical,—the individuality of man being for the time depressed and silenced: while the Hebrews understood it that human individuality was only humbled, but thereby also exalted and purified, and thus set free and quickened. The Alexandrians reasoned on the supposition that originally the Divine and the human mind were heterogeneous, and that in the course of history this gulf was bridged over; while the Hebrews proceeded on the idea of an original homogeneousness, and held that the discord which appeared in the course of history was more or less removed by the influence of grace. Hence it was that they alone properly appreciated the Divine element of Scripture in its human form—the "apples of gold in pictures of silver." The Alexandrian idea was substantially that which, at a later period, was urged by the Montanists. This view of inspiration was rejected by the ancient Church. Still, kindred notions again partially prevailed in the seventeenth century. Rationalism was of course incompetent to remedy such a defect. If theologians had formerly overlooked the human individuality in the composition of Scripture, the Rationalists went to the opposite and more dangerous extreme of denying the Divine character

of Scripture altogether, or at least of confining the Divine element to the operation of mere reason, or to special providence, or to moral elevation on the part of the writers. Inspiration necessarily implies the presence and sway of the Spirit of God in the writer, whereby he becomes the organ of that Spirit. The impulse or motive power (*impulsus*), the communication or the contents (*suggestio*), and the guidance toward the object aimed at (*directio*), are all divine, and conform to the objects and aim of the kingdom of God. But this also implies that inspiration itself is subject to certain limitations or conditions. These are either *religious conditions*, flowing from the nature of this object; or *intellectual conditions*, arising from its gradual realization; or *organic conditions*, connected with Him who is the great centre of that object; or, lastly, *ethical conditions*, springing from the personal holiness of that object. In other words, 1, The Bible, as inspired, is a book of religion, and not an astronomical, geological, or scientific revelation. 2, It has gradually progressed from the incompleteness of the Old, to the perfectness of the New Testament. 3, It has its centre in Christ, as God incarnate, and as the absolute revelation of God in human form. 4, It must never be considered as the effect of a morbid state of body or mind on the part of the writers (such as clairvoyance), but always as the result of direct moral and spiritual intercourse of the personal and living God with the personal mind of man. The Spirit of God was indeed strong enough to preserve the sacred writers from essential mistakes or false testimonies and traditions, and to secure to their writings the impress of never-fading freshness of youth, although He never could nor would force them to speak otherwise than in language conformable to the current ideas of the people, and to their own intellectual development.

We are now prepared to answer that much vexed modern question,—whether the Holy Scriptures be the Word of God *itself*, or whether the Word of God be *in* the Holy Scriptures. Viewing the Bible in its individual parts and sections, we reply, The Word of God is *in* the Bible. But, regarding it as an organic whole, of which all the parts point to Christ and proceed from Christ, we must confess: Holy Writ, as it explains itself, and opens up from book to book and from verse to verse, is the one harmonious and complete Word of God.*

On the *literature* of inspiration, comp. the Encyclops.; also the works of Wilson, Haldane, Rudelbach, and Gaussen. We specially refer to Fr. de Rougemont, *Christ et ses témoins*, 2 vols. Paris and Lausanne, 1856—a work which equally opposes the views of Gaussen and the false spiritualism of the Strassburg school of Scherer and others. [W. Lee: *The Inspiration of the Holy Scripture, its Nature and Proof.* Dublin and New York, 1857, 478 pages. —P. S.]

4. The Holy Scriptures in their Human Aspect; or, History of the Holy Scriptures (Isagogics in the narrower sense).

The period over which the composition of Holy Scripture extends, reaches from Moses to the Apostle John, or from about 1500 before to 100 after Christ,—a period of sixteen centuries,—irrespective of the oral traditions and of those small commencements of scriptura. records which preceded the time of Moses.

Equally great is the distance of places where these books were written, varying from Jerusalem and Babylon to Rome, and embracing all Palestine and Greece.

The Bible was composed in the two leading languages of antiquity, which reflect the greatest contrast in the intellectual world. The Hebrew tongue may be charac-

* Comp. Lange's *Philosophische Dogmatik*, p. 540 sqq.

terized as the most unstudied and childlike, as the deepest, purest, and most direct language of spiritual experience; while the Greek is the most cultivated, refined, and philosophical expression of intellectual life. The inspired writers were shepherds and kings, men learned and men unlettered. The diversity of form in the Scriptures appears not only objectively in their contents and character (being partly historical, partly poetic, partly apophthegmatic, partly prophetic, and partly epistolary), but also subjectively in their style and composition, each book bearing a faithful impress of the individuality of its writer. Not reckoning the Apocrypha, the Old Testament comprises thirty-nine books (counting the Book of Lamentations separately), while the New Testament contains twenty-seven separate writings. Yet, from the unity of spirit pervading this vast literary collection, they constitute, really, only one book—a second intellectual creation (Ps. xix.).

The science of *General* Isagogics treats of Scripture as a whole, giving the history,—1, of the collection, or of the canon; 2, of the present form and character of the text, of the various codd. and editions; 3, of its spread, or of the translations and quotations; 4, of its application, or of interpretation. The science of *Special* Isagogics treats of separate books, discussing their authorship, time, place, occasion, character, contents, division, and literature.

On the Introduction to the Holy Scriptures and its literature, compare Hagenbach's *Encycl.* pp. 140, 144, and the excellent works of Hertwig: *Tables to the Introduction into the Old Testament.* Berlin, 1856; and *to the Introduction into the New Testament.* Berlin, 1855.

5. The Holy Scriptures in their Christological, Divine-Human (Theanthropic) Character; or, the Scriptures as the Canon. The Old and the New Testament.

Viewed in their Christological character, the Holy Scriptures are the canon, both as the record of the revelation completed in Christ, and as the rule of the Christian life of faith. According to this Christological principle, they are divided into the Old and New Testaments (*testamentum*, διαθήκη, בְּרִית), to indicate that the Old Testament is the incomplete commencement which is explained, fulfilled, and glorified by the New, embodying, as it does, absolute perfectness. According to the same principle, the Apocrypha are kept distinct, as a mere appendix to the Bible, which, so to speak, forms an intermediate link between the canonical Scriptures and common literature. Lastly, viewed in this light, the Scriptures bear special reference to the development of the Christian Church and of the Christian life, where their teaching is expressed in a logical form (more especially in confessions of faith), while at the same time they serve as the rule, standard, and guide on all questions of doctrine.

The expression *Canon* implies not merely that the Bible is a sacred book, but that in its pages revelation continues, by the agency of the Spirit, an ever-present and ever-sufficient reality. As the canon, the Bible is, so to speak, the Word of God incarnate, which, by means of writing, continues spiritually effectual to the present time. The Old Testament is not merely the book of the Old Covenant, but the Old Covenant itself as the type of the New. Similarly, the New Testament is the New Covenant itself, the Gospels are the Gospel, and the apostolic writings, the living word of the Apostles.

The organic Christological relationship between the Old and New Testament, according to which the former is the preparation, the introduction, and the growth

of the New, while the latter is the fulfilment, the abrogation, and the completion of the Old, is indicated in the Old Testament itself, and amply confirmed in the New (Deut. xviii. 18; Isa. lxvi. 3; Jer. xxxi. 31, 32; Ezek. xxxvi. 25; Dan. ii. 44; Hos. ii. 19, etc.; and 2 Cor. iii. 7; Matt. v. 17–20, xii. 40, 42; John i. 17, 18, viii. 56; Gal. iii. 25; Heb. viii. 7, etc.).

The relationship between the canonical and the apocryphal books was correctly defined by the ancient Jewish synagogue, and, after it, by the ancient Greek and the modern Protestant Churches in opposition to the Roman Catholic theory. The Apocrypha serve, 1, as a kind of historical supplement, being a narrative of the kingdom of God during the period intervening between the Old and New Testaments; 2, as a record of popular piety, forming a distinct period between the age of the Prophets and that of the New Testament; 3, to exhibit the character of Alexandrian Judaism, though only a part of them is derived from that source; 4, as a background to the canon itself; 5, for private instruction and edification. Even the strictly Calvinistic Synod of Dort decided on retaining the Apocrypha along with the canon, and, despite their fallibility and mistakes, they are too deeply imbued with the genuine spirit of the Theocracy to rank them among the ἄτοπα καὶ δυσσεβῆ, in which Eusebius (iii. 25) places the heretical New Testament Apocrypha.

The Hebrews have divided the Old Testament into the Law (תּוֹרָה); the Prophets, נְבִיאִים (which includes the books of Joshua, of the Judges, of Samuel, and of the Kings); and the Writings generally (כְּתוּבִים), or Hagiographa. This division bears reference to the foundation, the historical development, and the edification of the Theocracy. The great preponderance of the prophetic books in the canon, clearly shows that Judaism was the *religion of the future*, and that the tendency of the Old Testament was ever towards the New. The arrangement of the canon adopted in Christian theology is that into Historical, Doctrinal, and Prophetical Books, corresponding to the same division in the New Testament.

According to this analogy we notice, 1, that to us the Law has become history; 2, that the Prophets are brought into immediate contact with the New Testament, and point out the tendency of the Old towards the New Covenant; while the circumstance that the New Testament contains only one prophetical book, although it is throughout a prophecy of the second coming of Christ, indicates the deep rest which the longings of the soul have found, in the appearance of Christ, and in the redemption which He has accomplished.

Viewing the Holy Scriptures as one connected canon, we may consider all doctrine as historical fact with historical efficacy, and all history as ideal, symbolical, typical, and spiritual, while in their prophetic portions they combine both these elements.

There is, of course, a difference between the genuine canon of Scripture and that which is current, in respect, 1, of unauthenticated readings, or variations; 2, of mistakes, or of infelicity of translation; 3, of the various misrepresentations of the genuine text by exegetical traditions.

The Scriptures, as canon, are necessarily *subordinate* to the living Saviour, and to the blessed Trinity. They are *the written revelation of Christ*, but not a second Christ; least of all when taken individually, and under the impression that the Old Testament is in every respect quite equal in authority to the New Testament. On the other hand, as the canon of Christ, the Scriptures must ever form the *directory* of the external Church, and of the individual Christian, in their fallible growth and

development, and are consequently *above* them. Finally, they are *coordinate*, or occupy the same line with the ideal life of Christ in the Church, and stand forth as a second spiritual creation *by the side* of God's revelation in nature.*

6. Import of the Holy Scriptures.

The Bible is a mystery of Divine Providence in the department of literature similar in character to the mystery of the incarnation itself. The incarnation of God in Christ has, so to speak, assumed a *bodily* expression in the essential Church, *i. e.*, in the preaching of the Gospel, on the basis of the apostolic office, and in the congregation of holy baptism and of the Eucharist. Similarly, the Scriptures are its *intellectual* or *spiritual* † expression.

It is simply *impiety* to designate the origin of the Bible as accidental, while the decrees of Synods and papal bulls are called necessary.

Holy Writ is the tradition of traditions, and the canon of canons. All other traditions and canons must be brought to the test of the Prophets and Apostles. And, in truth, the Bible reflects all times and places, or rather it is the reflex of eternity. Viewed in reference to its centre, it is the biography of the eternal Christ; viewed in its circumference, it is that of humanity: for, in the power of the prophetic spirit which pervades it, it embraces the end as well as the commencement of our world, and sounds the depths of hell as well as scales the heights of heaven. The book of God is also the book of the world; and, rightly understood, the book of nature as well as the book of the Spirit. There, the history of revelation becomes doctrine, and doctrine becomes history. Proceeding from the Spirit of God, it is fully understood only by the Spirit, even as it can only be explained and applied by the Spirit. To those who are called and waiting, it opens its mysteries; while to the hardened and the sinner it proves a closed book, as it were sealed with seven seals. Nay, like the Gospel itself, it is to some "a savour of life unto life;" to others, "a savour of death unto death." The outward senses may be absorbed by the letter only, and make an idol of it. In this respect the elements of Scripture have the same import and effect as those of the world. But just as the elements of the world are only rightly known when viewed in the unity of creation, and only wholly known if viewed as the symbolical Word of God, so the Bible is only rightly known when regarded as the second and spiritual creation, and wholly known when viewed as the second and higher revelation of God—the revelation of the foundation, of the reconciliation, and of the transformation of the world.

7. Relation between Holy Writ and the so-called Sacred Records of other Nations and Religions.

All the principal religions have chronicled their origin in sacred records, which ever afterwards were regarded as the standard for their development. The most renowned of these religious records are the Vedas of the Indians, the Kings of the Chinese, the Zendavesta of the Persians, the two Eddas of the ancient Germans, and the Koran of the Mohammedans. Even the Old Testament, when brought into

* [Dr. Lange's distinction between *untergeordnet*, *übergeordnet*, *gleichgeordnet*, and *beigeordnet* cannot be fully rendered, but is more clearly expressed above than in the Edinb. trsl.—P. S.]

† [Dr. Lange uses here the unusual term: *geisthaft*, as opposed to *leibhaft*, and with a shade of difference from *geistig* or *intellectual*, *geistlich* or *spiritual*, and *geisterhaft* or *ghost-like*. The antithesis is clear enough.—P. S.]

combination with the Jewish Talmud, becomes quite different from what it is when viewed in the light of the New Dispensation. To the Jews it has become a series of traditional statutes, upon which the covering of Moses rests. The Mormons of our day have stamped upon themselves the mark of apostasy, since, like Mohammed of old, they have adopted the falsified records of a new and spurious revelation.

The religious records of all nations are faithful representations of these religions themselves. All heathen religions are mythical,—the myth being the essential form of heathenism. But if form and substance are related, the contrast between Holy Scripture and myths must be as great in point of form as that between revealed religion and heathenism. In the Bible, religion has become faith, faith fact, fact sacred history, and sacred history the soul of secular history. Hence also biblical history gives not merely outward facts, but is itself symbolical. Hence also biblical doctrine is not a scholastic system, but also historical and deeply practical. Lastly, it is on this ground that Scripture presents such a wonderful concatenation and succession of history and of doctrine. But the antagonism of history and doctrine is transformed into a higher unity in the prophetical and poetical portions of Scripture.

Revealed religion discloses the errors of all other creeds, while at the same time it brings out any remnant of truth in them, which in turn may become a point of connection for the kingdom of God. Similarly, Holy Writ sheds light on the sacred records of the Gentiles, showing their utter insufficiency, their errors, and the traditions of truth which may have been preserved in them. Indeed, the same remark might be made with reference to all other literature. Thus in this sense also the Bible is the Book of books.

III. *Special Exegetics; or, the Art and Practice of Scriptural Exposition.*

Viewing it in the widest sense, all science and civilization, consciously or unconsciously, must serve as a kind of exposition of the Scriptures, and that whether the Scriptures be dragged down to the level of man, or man raised to the level of the Scriptures. (The Talmud, the New Testament.) Speaking more strictly, the spiritual life of the Christian Church, and more especially the pastoral office, may be regarded as an exposition of the Scriptures, with a twofold and diverse result (tradition, faith). Lastly, the same remark holds true of scriptural exposition in the narrowest and special sense of the term; and there is an exegesis which draws down Scripture to its own level, and another which rises to that of Scripture (mere dogmatism or rationalism on the one hand, and, on the other, the light of the Bible thrown upon exegesis, and that of exegesis upon the Bible).

Various qualifications are requisite for the right interpretation of the Scriptures. Thus the Bible as a whole must all along be compared with its individual parts; *exposition* must be closely connected with *explanation*, or the word with the life; exegetical tradition (or the analogy of faith as expressed in the various confessions of faith) and individuality must each have their proper place,—there must be proper submission, and yet proper independence; above all, the interpreter must ever realize that the Lord speaks, and that he is to hear,—or, in other words, the truth revealed must find a response in the obedience of faith, and again, in the prayer which it evokes.

The results of Exegesis are Bible History and Biblical Theology.

IV. *Bible History.*

Bible History differs from the general history of the kingdom of God, in that it delineates only the foundation of this kingdom by means of and during the course of revelation. It traces in historical succession the narrative contained in the Scriptures in all its essential features. In the Old Testament, it shows us all the elements of the life of faith, and sets before us many a precious example of faith and patience for our imitation; while in the New Testament it exhibits the history of faith and salvation "made perfect," both in the miracles and triumphs of the Lord, and in the deeds of His Apostles. Thus Bible History forms the basis of Church History.

Comp. the *Sacred Histories* of Hübner, Rauschenbusch, Zahn, Grube, Günther, Kurtz, etc.

V. *Biblical Theology.*

Biblical Theology may be regarded as the final result of exegesis, and at the same time as the basis of the History of Dogmas and of Systematic Theology. Its purpose is to trace the gradual yet uniform development of Christian doctrine and ethics throughout revelation. It may be divided into General and Special. The former follows the development of faith throughout Scripture, showing,—*a*, The *Divine* aspect of Scripture, or its one and all-pervading idea: the faith of revelation in the God of revelation. *b*, Its *human* aspect, or its gradual unfolding in the individual books of Scripture, according to the various stages of religious development and their character. *c*, Its *Christological* or *theanthropic* aspect, viewing revelation to its completion in Christ, and according to the different doctrinal types in the New Testament.—On the other hand, it is the task of Special Biblical Theology to trace the doctrines of Scripture from their first germs in the Old Testament to their completion in the New, viewing them in the light of theology, of anthropology, of Christology, and of the doctrine of the kingdom of God (Theocratology).

On the literature of the subject, comp. Hagenbach, pp. 197 and 201. [We mention de Wette, Steudel, Oehler, Lutz, on *Biblical Theology*, and especially the excellent work of the late Dr. Schmid, of Tübingen: *The Biblical Theology of the N. T.* Stuttg., 1853, in 2 vols.—P. S.]

VI. *Appendix. Exegetical and Homiletical Helps.**

1. **Biblical Philology.**—

a) *Hebrew Grammar:* Gesenius, Rödiger, Ewald, Stier, Freitag, Hupfeld, Thiersch, Nägelsbach. [Engl. works: Stuart, Conant, Bush, Tregelles, Nordheimer, Green.—P. S.]

b) *Hebrew Dictionaries:* Buxtorf, Coccejus, Simonis, Simonis-Winer, Gesenius, Schröder, Fürst, Maurer. [Robinson's Gesenius, 3d ed., Bost., 1849; B. Davidson and Bagster's *Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon* (with a grammatical analysis of each word in the H. Bible), London, 1848.—P. S.]

c) *New Testament Grammar:* Winer [6th ed., Leipz., 1855. Two Engl. trsl.—P. S.], Alt, Buttmann.

d) *New Testament* (and *Septuagint*) *Dictionaries:* Schöttgen, Schleussner, Wahl, Bretschneider, Schirlitz, Wilke, Dalmer, [Robinson: *A Greek and Engl. Lexicon of the N. T.*, the *new* ed., New York, 1851, etc., and Bagster's *Analytical Greek Lexicon*, Lond., 1852.—P. S.]

2. **Archæology.**—*Geography of Palestine:* Ritter (*Erdkunde*, vol. xv.), K. von Raumer, Bräm, Crome, Völter, Robinson, [Stanley, Thomson, Hackett, Bausman.—P. S.] Maps of Grimm, Kiepert, Zimmermann, and the *Bibel-Atlas* of Weiland, Weimar, 1832, [and of Jenks, Coleman, and the American Tract Society.—P. S.] *Topography of Jerusalem.* Schulz (Berlin, 1845), Krafft (Bonn, 1846), Tobler, Robinson, Berggren.

3. **Introduction to the Bible.**—Bertholdt, de Wette, Scholz, Eichhorn, Schott, Hug, Credner,

* [This whole section is omitted in the Edinb. trsl.—P. S.]

Guericke, Reuss, Hengstenberg (*Beiträge*), Hävernik, Keil, etc.; [also the posthumous works of Bleek, and the English works of Horne and Davidson.—P. S.]

4. **Editions of the Bible.**—*Polyglot* Bible by Stier and Theile (Bielefeld, 2d ed., 1854, 4 vols.). The *Hebr. Old* Testament by Simonis, van der Hooght, Hahn, Theile. The *Septuagint* by Breitinger, Tischendorf, and Paris edition. The *Greek* Testament by Griesbach, Knapp, Schott, Hahn, Lachmann (small and large editions), Theile, Tischendorf (Leipz. 1841, '48, '49, 59, different ed.), etc. *Synopsis* or *Harmonies of the Gospels:* Griesbach, de Wette and Lücke, Rödiger, Anger, Tischendorf, Robinson (all in Greek), Lex (*Die Evangelien-Harmonie*, Wiesbaden, 1835), [Robinson, Strong, in English.—P. S.] The *Vulgate* by van Ess, Kistemaker, etc.

[NOTE.—The best of the many ed. of TISCHENDORF, which I have used in this Engl. edition of Lange's Matthew, is the large critical edition in 2 vols.: *Novum Testamentum Græce. Ad antiquos testes denuo recensuit, apparatum criticum omni studio perfectum apposuit*, etc. Edit. septima, Lips. 1859. The smaller critical edition in one vol. (ed. ii. 1849) gives a sufficient amount of critical apparatus for ministers and students. In connection with this, reference should be had now also to Tischendorf's edition of the famous *Codex Sinaiticus*, discovered by him, and issued in 1863.

Of LACHMANN I have used the large edition in two volumes with the Latin translation: *Novum Testamentum Græce et Latine.* Berolini, 1842 and 1850.

I have also compared occasionally STIER and THEILE: *Polyglotten-Bibel*, 2d ed., 1849; and PHILIPPUS BUTTMANN: *Novum Testamentum Græce ad fidem codicis Vaticani*, (Cod. B.) Berol., 1862, (in new Greek type, conformed to the ancient uncial MSS., the Greek inscriptions of the Augustan age, and the Pompeyan papers.)

The best *English* editions of the *Greek* Testament, to which I have more or less frequently referred in the course of the work, are the following:

Dr. S. T. BLOOMFIELD: *The Greek Testament with English Notes*, 9th ed., Lond., 1855, 2 vols., with a supplementary volume of *Critical Annotations*, Lond., 1860, which contains a digest of the various readings, and embodies the investigation of seventy uncollated or ill-collated MSS. and the valuable materials derived from Scrivener's collation of seventy MSS.

W. WEBSTER and W. F. WILKINSON: *The Greek Testament with Notes, Critical and Exegetical.* Lond., 1855, 2 vols. Anglican, useful "for learners rather than the learned."

Dr. HENRY ALFORD: *The Greek Testament*, etc., 4th ed., Lond. 1859, 4 vols. The first vol. containing the four Gospels, was reprinted, from the third ed., by the Harpers of New York, 1859. Alford gives a revised text, and a critical digest of various readings (entirely rewritten in the 4th ed.) between the text and the comments. He surpasses his English predecessors, is essentially orthodox (Anglican) and evangelical, yet critical, liberal, progressive, and made good use of the Germans, especially Olshausen, Tischendorf, de Wette and Meyer.

Dr. CHR. WORDSWORTH: *The New Testament in the original Greek: with Notes*, new ed. in 2 vols., Lond., 1862. Conservative, reverential, patristic and Anglican.

Dr. S. P. TREGELLES (a Plymouth brother, and a believer in the absolute plenary inspiration): *The Greek New Testament*, edited from ancient authorities, with various readings of all the ancient MSS., the ancient versions, and earlier eccles. writers (to Eusebius incl.), together with the Latin version of Jerome, Lond., vol. i. containing the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, 1859; vol. ii., containing Luke and John, 1860. Not yet completed. Tischendorf does him injustice in his large ed. of 1859, Prolegg., p. cxiii sqq. Tregelles is one of the few scholars who have made the restoration of the genuine apostolic text of the N. T. the work of their life, and, like Bengel, unites with critical learning and laborious research a childlike faith and profound reverence for the Word of God. Mr. Scrivener, in his *Introduction to the Criticism of the N. T.* (1861), p. 347, remarks: "Every one who venerates the spectacle of time and substance freely bestowed in the best of causes, without the prospect or indeed the possibility of earthly reward, will grieve to know that the further prosecution of his *opus magnum* is for a while suspended by Dr. Tregelles' serious illness."—P. S.]

5. **Criticism.**—Capelli, Kenicott, Bengel, Griesbach, Reiche, Schleiermacher, Löhnis, Lachmann, Tischendorf. [Bloomfield, Alford, Wordsworth, Tregelles, in the critical parts of their ed. of the Gr. Test., and especially the able work of Fr. H. Scrivener: *A plain Introduction to the Criticism of the N. T. for the use of Biblical students.* Cambridge, 1861. —P. S.] Kirchhofer: *Quellensammlung zur Geschichte des N. T. Kanons.* Zürich, 1844. Olshausen *on the Genuineness of all the books of the N. T.* [Engl. trsl. by Fosdick, prefixed to vol. i. of Kendrick's Olshausen.—P. S.] Thiersch *on the Canon*, 1845. Ebrard: *Kritik der evang. Geschichte* [not *Schriften*, as the original reads.—P. S.], 2d ed., 1850. [Engl. *condensed* trsl., Edinb., 1863.] Bleek: *Beiträge zur Evangelienkritik.* [Westcott: *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels.* Amer. ed. with an introduction by Hor. B. Hackett. Boston, 1862. —P. S.] Also Neander, Lange, Schaff, Thiersch, *on the Apostolic Age.* For the O. T.: Hengstenberg, Hävernick, Keil, Bleek, etc.

6. **Translations.**—Luther's last original edition of his German Bible, by Bindseil and Niemeyer, Halle, 1850. Von Hoff, Leipz., 1851. Other *German* Bible versions: by Friedr. von Meyer, Stier (Bielefeld, 1856), de Wette, the Zürich transl., and the Roman Catholic translations of Leander van Ess, Braun, Brentano, Allioli, Dereser, etc. [*English* versions: Wiclif, A. D. 1380; Tyndale, 1534; Cranmer, 1539; Geneva, 1560; The Bishop's Bible, 1568; Authorized, or King James's, 1611. Roman Catholic versions: Anglo-Rhemish, 1582, and Douay Bible, 1609, etc. *See* Bagster's English *Hexapla*, London; also Mrs. H. C. Conant: *Hist. of the Engl. Bible.* New York, 1856. The publications of the *American Bible Union*, N. York, especially the revised versions of Lillie, Conant, and Hackett. Dean Trench *on the Revision of the C. V.*, Lond., 1858. Dr. Alford's revised Engl. N. Test., Lond., 1863. The authorized English Bible of 1611 is, upon the whole, the best of all Bible versions ancient and modern. Comp. John

H. Newman's eloquent testimony in its favor, after his transition to Rome; also the testimony of Marsh in his *Lectures on the English Language*.—P. S.]

7. **Commentaries on the Whole Bible.**—*Critici sacri*, several editions. Amsterd., 1698; Frankf. a. M., 1700, etc. Polus: *Synopsis*, Frkf., 1712, 5 vols. Grotius: *Annotationes*. On the *Old* Testament: Rosenmüller (*Scholia*), Maurer, the *Exeget. Manual* (Germ.) of Leipz., 1838 sqq., (rationalistic in part). On the *New T.*: Calvin, Wolf (*Curæ philologicæ et criticæ*, 1741, 5 vols.), Bengel [*Gnomon*, Lat., Germ., and in two Engl. transl.], Olshausen [transl. into Engl., Edinb.; Amer. ed., revised by Dr. Kendrick, N. Y. 1856, etc.], de Wette, Meyer. [English Commentaries on the *whole* Bible: Henry, Scott, J. Gill, Clarke, Patrick—Lowth—Whitby, David Brown (Glasgow, 1863); on the *New* T.: Hammond, Doddridge, Burkitt, Bloomfield, Alford, Wordsworth, Webster and Wilkinson, Barnes, Owen, Jacobus.—P. S.]

8. **Commentaries on Separate Books.**—*See* list in Hagenbach: *Theol. Encycl.*, p. 179 sqq., and Winer: *Handbuch der theol. Lit.*, i., p. 33 sqq., 162 sqq. [On *Genesis* and the *Pentateuch*: Calvin, Luther, Hengstenberg, Tuch, Bertheau, Gerlach, Delitzsch, Bush. On the other *historical* books of the O. T.: Keil, Maurer, Thenius, Movers, Bertheau, Bush. On the *Psalms*: Luther, Calvin, De Wette, Tholuck, Hengstenberg, Hupfeld, Delitzsch, Jos. Add. Alexander, Isaac Taylor. On *Job*: Ewald, Umbreit, Hirzel, Schlottmann, Barnes, Conant. On the *Proverbs*: Umbreit, Stier, Bertheau, M. Stuart. On the *Song of Songs*: Herder, Umbreit, Ewald, Hengstenberg, Delitzsch. On *Ecclesiastes*: Umbreit, Knobel, Bertheau, Hengstenberg. On *Isaiah*: Gesenius, Hitzig, Dressler, Händewerk, Jos. Add. Alexander. On *Jeremiah*: Hitzig, Umbreit. On *Ezekiel*: Hävernick, Hitzig. On *Daniel*: Hävernick, Hengstenberg, Lengerke, Hitzig, Auberlen. On the *Minor prophets*: Theiner, Ackermann, Hitzig, Henderson, Pusey.—On the *New* Testament: On the *Four Gospels* (either separately or in harmonies): Calvin, Olshausen, Meyer, Macknight, Campbell, Greswell, Owen, Jacobus; also *Catena aurea* on the Gospels from the Fathers, collected by Thomas Aquinas. Oxf., 1843. On *Matthew* and *Mark*: Fritzsche, Jos. Add. Alexander, Conant. On *Luke*: van Osterzee (in Lange's *Bibelwerk*). On the *Gospel of St. John*: Lampe, Lücke, Tholuck, Luthardt, Hengstenberg. On the *Sermon on the Mount*: Tholuck. On the *Parables* and *Miracles*: Trench. On all the *Discourses of Jesus*: Stier: *Reden Jesu*. (*The Words of the Lord Jesus*, trsl. by Pope, and republ. twice in America.) On the *Acts*: Baumgarten, Hackett, Jos. Add. Alexander. On all the *Epistles of St. Paul*: Calvin, MacKnight, Conybeare and Howson (*Life and Epistles of St. Paul*. Lond. and N. York ed.). On *separate* epistles of Paul: Tholuck (on the *Romans*), Fritzsche (ditto, 3 vols., Latin), Rückert, Mos. Stuart (ditto), Osiander (*Corinthians*), Winer, Usteri, Wieseler (*Galatians*), Harless, Stier (on the *Ephesians*), Huther, Wiesinger (the *smaller* and the *Pastoral* Epistles), Neander (*Corinthians*, *Philippians*, etc.), Pelt, Lillie (*Thessalonians*), Hackett (*Philemon*), Hodge (on *Romans*, 1 *Corinthians*, and *Ephesians*), Ellicott, (the English Meyer, on *Galatians*, *Ephesians*, *Thessalonians*, etc., republished in Andover, 1860, sqq.). On the Epistle to the *Hebrews*: Bleek (a real exegetical masterpiece, in 3 vols., 1828–1840), Tholuck, Stuart, Ebrard (as continuator of Olshausen). On the *Catholic* Epistles: Steiger (on *Peter*), Lücke, Neander, Rickli, Düsterdieck, Ebrard (on *John's Epistles*), Archbishop Leighton (on 1 *Peter*), Schneckenburger, Kern, Neander, Stier (on *James*), Stier (on *Jude*). On the Apocalypse: Bengel, Auberlen, Hengstenberg, Lücke, Düsterdieck, Ebrard, Bleek, Elliott, Mos. Stuart.—P. S.]

9. **Bible Dictionaries** (of things).—Winer: *Bibl. Real-Wörterbuch*, 2 vols., 3d ed., 1848 (critical), Zeller: *Biblisches Wörterbuch*, 2 vols., 1856 (popular, and very useful). Many articles in Herzog's *Real-Encyclop. für Prot. Theol.*, [*condensed* transl. of Bomberger and others, unfinished.] Oetinger: *Bibl. Wörterbuch*, newly ed. by Hamberger, Stuttg., 1850. [*English* Bible Dictionaries: Taylor's, and Robinson's *Calmet*, Kitto, W. Smith (London and Boston, 1863, 3 vols.), and, for popular use, those of the American Tract Society, and of the American Sunday-School Union.—P. S.]

10. **General Bible Works** for *practical* and *homiletical* use.—Christoph Starke (Past. primarius of Driesen): *Synopsis Bibliothecæ exegeticæ in Vetus et Novum Testamentum*; *oder kurzgefasster Auszug der gründlichsten und nutzbarsten Auslegungen*, 2d ed., Leipz., 1740, 10 vols. The *Berleburger Bibel*, 1726–'39, 8 vols. fol., new ed., 1857, J. J. Hess: *Bibelwerk*, Zürich, 1776–1812, 23 parts. H. & W. Richter: *Erklärte Hausbibel*, Barmen, 1840. O. v. Gerlach: *Das A. und N. Test. mit Einleitungen und erklärenden Anmerkungen*, Berlin, 1854. Lisco: *Das A. und N. Test. mit erklärenden Anmerkungen*. Matthew Henry: *An Exposition of the O. and N. T.*, London, 1849, 6 vols., [and many older Engl. and Amer. editions. Henry's Com. is very spiritual and practical, and widely popular in England and America. The same is true of Thomas Scott: *The holy Bible, with original notes, practical observations*, etc., first 1788, 5th and best ed., Lond. 1822, in 6 vols., and often since.—P. S.] Braun (Rom. Cath.): *Die heil. Schrift, lat. u. deutsch nach dem Sinne der h. röm. Kirche, der h. Kirchenväter*, etc., Augsb., 1789–1806, 13 vols.

SECOND SECTION.

GENERAL AND SPECIAL INTRODUCTION TO THE NEW TESTAMENT.

---

§ 1.

THE NEW TESTAMENT.

I. *The Name: New Testament.*

The term *New Testament* unquestionably proceeds from the institution of the Lord's Supper. The Lord designates the Eucharist the New Covenant in His blood, in the strict sense of the term. The New Testament fellowship of believers reconciled to God by Christ, which commences in, and is introduced by baptism, is completed and appears outwardly in the Holy Supper. In the Eucharist the Lord carries out that New Covenant with the Church which is founded upon His holy life and His Word, upon His atoning death, His victory, and on the conversion of individual believers. While the celebration of the Eucharist is a remembrance of the first foundation of the Church, it ever inaugurates anew the formation of the Church, and also serves as its manifestation. Hence the writings which record the foundation of this new and eternal covenant are themselves called the New Covenant, the New Testament. Lastly, this designation indicates the connection and the contrast between these writings and those of the Old Covenant.

II. *Origin of the New Testament.*

The first commencement of the New Testament dates, in all probability, from the period when the Lord lived and taught on earth. *It has ever been the practice to write down that which was deemed most memorable.* Accordingly, it can scarcely be supposed that any one acquainted with letters should have been brought into contact with the Lord, or come under the influence of His Spirit, without noting down the most striking occurrences he had witnessed, or the most weighty truths he had heard. In this manner some brief memoirs must have been composed before any of the New Testament writings had been compiled—a fact to which, indeed, the Evangelist Luke bears testimony (ch. i. 1). Nay, more, we are warranted in assuming that the most important events in the early history of Christ, such as the song of praise of Zacharias, of the Virgin, and of old Simeon, may have been written down at a very early period. To our mind it seems natural that Matthew, who was probably the most practised writer* among the Apostles, should very early have collected together the sayings of the Lord; and similarly, that John should have made a collection of His discourses.

* [*Der schreibkundigste*, the best penman. The Edinb. trsl. mistakes the sense in rendering this: *the best educated*. Dr. Lange refers simply to the mechanism of writing, in which Matthew, as a former collector of customs, by constant practice, had acquired more ease and skill than the other Apostles, who were fishermen. As to natural talent and education, Peter, Paul, and John were undoubtedly his superiors. Luke also had more learning, being a physician by profession, and a superior Greek scholar.—P. S.]

But such memorabilia were only the faithful historical recollections of individuals. Before the New Testament could be written, the work of the Lord required to be finished, and His Holy Spirit poured out upon the Apostles, that thus they might be fully fitted for their high calling.

The original mission intrusted to the Apostles and the seventy disciples—to testify of the Lord after the completion of His life and work—necessarily implied also the duty of writing about Him, as opportunity afforded. If, according to the Saviour's injunction, they were to devote all their energies to this work, to apply every means, to seize every opportunity for its promotion, they must, of course, also have employed the powerful instrumentality of literature. Nor were they unfaithful to their calling. As they went forth into all the world preaching the Gospel, so also did they address themselves to all ages by their writings. And, as at last, at the end of the world, they shall again meet, the faithful messengers of the Lord, who by the instrumentality of the Church (which they had served to plant) have fulfilled their great commission of preaching the Gospel to every creature, so also will they be found to have accomplished their work through the writings of the New Testament.

As the composition of the New Testament formed, like the preaching of the Word, part of the great mission which the Lord intrusted to His Apostles, it required special Divine preparation and illumination by the Holy Ghost. Just as "holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," so wrote they by the same Spirit. The inspiration bestowed on them for the purposes of their apostolic calling, was at the same time the source of their preaching and of their writings.

But, while asserting the Divine origin of the New Testament, we do not by any means overlook the human form in which it was cast. On the contrary, that human form appeared all the more genuinely when it became the vehicle of Divine revelation. Hence, the New Testament writings are clothed in the language of Greece, and couched in its peculiar mode of thought. This form constitutes another contrast between the Old and the New Testament. The language of the Old Testament (the Hebrew) is that of feeling, of directness, and of the esoteric religion of the Jews. The language of the New Testament is that of full intellectual consciousness (νοῦς), of matured reflection, and of the exoteric religion of all nations. But the New Testament is also imbued with the spirit of the Old; and whenever there is any direct and esoteric presentation of revelation (the speaking ἐν πνεύματι), we meet with frequent Hebraisms, especially in the Book of Revelation.

III. *Chronological Succession of the books of the New Testament.*

The oldest apostolic letter is that addressed by the Synod at Jerusalem, about the year 53 [or rather A. D. 50—P. S.], to the Gentile Christian Churches, and which is recorded by Luke in the 15th chapter of Acts.

Soon afterward Paul wrote his first letters to the Churches. The apostolic writings may be arranged in the following order of succession:—

1. The two Epistles to the Thessalonians, written from Corinth, about 54 or 55 [53—P. S.].

2. The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians, written from Ephesus, about the year 56 or 57.

3. The two Epistles of Paul to the Corinthians, written from Ephesus and Macedonia, about the year 58.

4. The Epistle of Paul to the Romans, written from Corinth, about the year 59.

5. The Epistle of James, written from Jerusalem, and addressed to the Jewish Christians in the Diaspora, about the year 62.

6. The Epistles of Paul to the Ephesians, to the Colossians, and to Philemon, written from Rome, about the year 63.

7. The Epistle of Paul to the Philippians, written from Rome, about the year 64.

8. The Epistle to the Hebrews, the Gospel by Luke, and the Acts of the Apostles, written probably from the same place, or at least from Italy, and about the same time—the year 64.

9. The First Epistle of Peter, written from Babylon, about the year 64.

10. The First Epistle of Paul to Timothy, written from Macedonia, between 64 and 66 [?].

11. The Epistle of Paul to Titus, written from Macedonia, or from Greece, between 64 and 66 [?].

12. The Second Epistle of Paul to Timothy, written from Rome, about the year 67 or 68 [?].

13. The Second Epistle of Peter, written in the same place, and about the same time, about 67 or 68.

14. The Gospel by Mark, written in Rome, about the year 68.

15. The Gospel by Matthew, written in Judea, about the year 68 or 69.

16. The Gospel by John, written about the year 70.

17. The Epistle of Jude, written probably between the years 80 and 90

18. The Revelation of John, written about the year 95.

19. The three Epistles of John, written probably between the years 96 and 100 [?].*

IV. *Critical Collection of the New Testament Canon.*

It will be readily granted that the various Churches carefully preserved the epistles and writings of the Apostles, and those of their assistants, the Evangelists Mark and Luke. The idea that several apostolic writings, more especially a third Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, and an Epistle to the Laodiceans by the same Apostle, have been lost, owes its origin to a misunderstanding of some allusions in the New Testament. (Comp. Lange's *Apost. Age*, I. 205 sqq.) But it is probable that at a later period Mark himself enlarged his Gospel by adding to it a conclusion, appended to that which it had in its original shape; as also, that at the commencement of the second century, the well-known passage in the Second Epistle of Peter was inserted after the Epistle of Jude. (*Apost. Age*, I. 152.) These circumstances, however, do not affect the authenticity of the text. The interpolation of the trinitarian passage in 1 John v., between vers. 7 and 8, is of much later date. The Gospel of Matthew, originally written in Hebrew, was translated at a very early period, and probably by Matthew himself, into our present Greek Gospel, which has ever since been received as canonical in the Church.

It was natural that the writings of the Apostles should be communicated from

* [The chronological dates assigned to the apostolic writings by Dr. Lange slightly differ in three or four instances from those adopted in my *History of the Apostolic Church*. Of some books it is impossible accurately to ascertain the time of composition.—P. S.]

one church to the other, and extensively diffused, since many of them were evangelical epistles, addressed to several, or to all Christian communities (as, for example, the Epistle to the Hebrews, that of James, the two Epistles of Peter, the First Epistle of John, the seven epistles in the Book of Revelation, and the Epistle to the Ephesians). Besides, the practice was also distinctly prescribed by the Apostles (Col. iv. 16). Accordingly, we find even in the New Testament an allusion to collections of apostolic writings, more especially of those of Paul, as in the Second Epistle of Peter (iii. 16), with which also Acts xvi. may be compared with reference to the address of the Synod of Jerusalem, recorded in Acts xv.

Such collections of apostolic writings rendered something like critical examination necessary, to enable the churches to distinguish between what was genuine and what spurious. It is remarkable that so early as in the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians (2 Thess. ii. 2), which is the second oldest of the New Testament writings, we find an appeal to the critical sense of the churches. So long, indeed, as some of the Apostles, or even their immediate disciples, lived and taught, the stream of oral apostolical tradition was so abundant and so pure, that some preferred to apply directly to that source of instruction. Thus we account, for example, for the circumstance that Papias, a disciple of John, who lived at the commencement of the second century, mentions the Gospels of Matthew and of Mark, but, instead of referring to those of Luke and of John, records the names of the men whose presence and instructions had in his case filled the place of these Gospels (Euseb. iii. 33; comp. Lange, *Leben Jesu*, I. 151, and *Apost. Age*, I. 215). Even in the writings of the apostolic Fathers we meet with frequent evidence of their familiarity with the New Testament writings. On these various testimonies, as they multiply with the lapse of time, as also on the various forms and lists of the canon to its final close in the fourth century, compare the various Introductions to the New Testament.

Nor must we omit to mention that, during the first three centuries, the Church amply proved its critical capacity by rejecting from the canon that vast mass of apocryphal writings which claimed admission into the New Testament. But the deep contrast between these works and the spirit of the New Testament has only lately been fully brought to light, in connection with the controversy about the mythical theory of Strauss. (Compare the literature on the subject as given by Winer, and the collections of New Testament Apocrypha, by Fabricius, Thilo, and Tischendorf.)

V. *Unity and Organic Arrangement of the New Testament.*

DIVISION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

At first, it seemed as if the ancient Church would have adopted an arrangement of the New Testament writings substantially similar to that of the Jews for the Old Testament. Thus we find mention of three sections of the New Testament, to correspond with the ancient division into Law, Prophets, and Hagiographa. Besides the arrangement into τὸ εὐαγγέλιον and ὁ ἀπόστολος (Clemens Alex.), τὰ εὐαγγελικὰ καὶ τὰ ἀποστολικά (Irenæus)—by which they meant the Gospels, and, in the first place at least, the writings of St. Paul—we also find mention of a third collection under the name of καθολικαὶ ἐπιστολαί, which seems to have included the apostolic writings generally, καθόλου (see Hug. *Einl. in's N. T.*, vol. ii., p. 428). This explanation of the word καθολικός has been controverted; but the fact that the Epistle to the

Hebrews, although catholic in its tenor, was not included among the Catholic Epistles, because its authorship was attributed to St. Paul, speaks in favor of the above suggestion. This division of the New Testament, however, fell to the ground when the canon was completed. Hence there can be no valid objection to the modern division into Historical, Doctrinal, and Prophetic books. But it deserves notice that the Book of Acts was originally, and also in the Scripture lessons, included among the Epistles, and this with good reason; for in the strict historical sense, it belongs not to the period of the Gospel history, but to that of the foundation of the Church by the Apostles, and serves as historical basis to the Epistles. Properly speaking, it forms a transition from the historical to the doctrinal books.

This division of the New Testament is warranted by the peculiar cast, and by the prevailing characteristics of its various books, although in a certain sense each of them contains, at the same time, history, doctrine, and prophecy. Keeping this arrangement in view, the New Testament canon presents to our mind the eternal *past, present, and future of the Church; Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever*—or Christ in His historical manifestation, in His rule over the Church, and in His glorious advent. But here each part is organically connected with the other, just as, in the idea of eternal life, the past, the present, and the future pervade and interpenetrate each other. "All the writings of the New Testament contain, in the first place, the basis, or the ideal past of the Church; next, its standard, or the rule for its present development; lastly, its final aim, or the goal of its future." (See my *Apost. Age*, ii., p. 571.)

The historical books describe the first manifestation and the foundation of the kingdom of heaven in our world, and its inroad upon the world, with a view to final conquest, by the planting of the apostolic Church. The doctrinal books are intended to serve as a directory for the development of Christian and ecclesiastical life in the kingdom of heaven, or of the kingdom of heaven as manifest in ecclesiastical and Christian life, in all its relations to the world, whether hostile or peaceable. This development is ever based upon, and traced to, the first coming of Christ for the redemption of man. Lastly, the prophetical books are intended to guide this development of Christian and ecclesiastical life, in accordance with the prophetic announcement and description of the second advent of Christ. The foundation of the kingdom of heaven—its unfolding—its future conquests, and ultimate completion: such are the three parts which constitute the New Testament.

The Historical portion of the New Testament consists of two parts, the Gospels, and the Book of Acts. The former exhibits the eternal basis of the Church, and its foundation in time; the latter, the planting of the Church, its original form, and the first and prophetic outlines of its spread through the world.

---

§ 2.

HISTORICAL BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

The four Gospels, which together form only one Gospel (τὸ εὐαγγέλιον) under a fourfold aspect (κατὰ Ματθαῖον, etc.), constitute, along with the Book of Acts (πράξεις τῶν ἀποστόλων), the historical records of the New Testament.

The great leading idea which pervades this history, is the introduction of the kingdom of heaven (βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν), or its manifestation (at least, so far as its

principles and power are concerned)—the revelation of God being completed by the coming of the God-Man, the Redeemer of the world, and His kingdom founded upon earth by the planting of His Church through the power of the Holy Ghost. Accordingly, this evangelical history forms the centre of all history, by concluding that of the ancient and commencing that of the new world.

The difference between the historical books of the New Testament consists in this, that while the four Gospels record the history of the revelation of the kingdom of heaven, and of its *foundation* in the Person and the work of the Lord Jesus, the Book of Acts describes the royal administration of Christ as manifested in planting His kingdom in and for the world, by the power of the Holy Ghost working through the Apostles. The Gospels exhibit the kingdom of heaven in the Person of Christ; the Book of Acts, the Person of Christ in the kingdom of heaven; the former show us the kingdom of heaven upon the earth, yet above the earth, separate and distinct from all the world; the latter, the kingdom of heaven in the world—all its roots and fibres having taken hold upon the soil of earth. In the one case, we have the perfect revelation of God *in* the Spirit of Christ (the ἀποκάλυψις), in the other, *by* the Spirit of Christ (the φανέρωσις); in the one case, the descent of the heavenly Jerusalem upon the holy city, in the other, the spread of that heavenly kingdom from Jerusalem to Rome. The Gospels show us how Christ consecrated Himself for the world, and thereby reconciled it to God in that solemn judgment which the world pronounced upon itself; the Book of Acts teaches how Christ consecrated the world unto Himself, and thereby redeemed it. Yonder, the old era terminates, the principle of the new having appeared; here, the new era commences, the principle of the old having been mortified.

I. *The One Gospel in the Four Gospels.*

Viewed as a literary production, the Gospel history exists in a fourfold form. But for the ancient, true, churchly view, this circumstance is altogether secondary to the fact that under this fourfold form we have the one Gospel of the Lord. Strictly speaking, therefore, it is not the Gospel of Matthew, etc., as we now are accustomed to say, but the Gospel according to Matthew, according to Mark, according to Luke, and according to John. It is this grand unity of character, of history, of doctrine, and of spirit, which gives to the Gospels their common designation. Though we have four human writings, they form only one Divine record of the Gospel. To doubt this essential unity, is to lose to the same extent the capacity for the churchly appreciation and even the Christian understanding of the Gospels.

But even this does not exhaust the relation between the four Gospels and the one Evangel. Not only does the difference between the four Gospels not obscure the unity of the one Evangel; but this number four rather indicates the unfolding of the Evangel in all its fulness, so that it reflects the fourfold sway of God in the world, meets the fourfold wants and views of the world, and under a fourfold aspect displays the infinite riches of revelation.

Irenæus (*Advers. Hæres.* iii. 1) connected the vision of the four cherubim in Ezekiel i. with the four Gospels, and explained the symbolical meaning of that passage as applying to the distinctive peculiarities of the Evangelists. The idea was afterwards adopted and developed by the Fathers, and the four Gospels were compared with the vision of the four living creatures. Christian art has perpetuated the special arrangement of these symbols, proposed by Jerome, by assigning to Matthew

the symbol of the man, to Mark that of the lion, to Luke that of the ox or sacrificial bullock, and to John that of the eagle. (Comp. Credner: *Introd. to the N. T.*, p. 54.) Our own study of the Gospels would lead us to modify the interpretation of Jerome in so far as to regard Matthew under the symbol of the ox, and Luke under that of the man. (*Leben Jesu*, I. p. 156.) Stier has approved of this change.

The first Gospel is preëminently that of history, and of the fulfilment of the Old Testament by the sacrificial sufferings and death of Christ and the redemption thus achieved. Hence the sacrificial bullock is the appropriate symbol of Matthew.

The second Gospel presents to our minds the all-powerful revelation and working of Christ as direct from heaven, irrespectively of anything that preceded,—the completion of all former manifestations of the Deity. Symbol, the lion.

The third Gospel is preëminently that of perfect humanity,—human mercy presented in the light of Divine grace, the transformation of all human kindness into Divine love. Symbol, the figure of a man.

Lastly, the fourth Gospel exhibits the deep spiritual and eternal import of the history of Christ—the Divine element pervading and underlying its every phase,—and with it the transformation of all ideas, and of all ideals, in connection with Christ. Symbol, the eagle.

To this rapid sketch we might add, that the essential harmony of these Gospels cannot be properly appreciated, unless, while recognising their intrinsic unity, we also keep in mind those peculiar characteristics of the Evangelists on which the differences in their narratives depend.

LITERATURE.*—On the Gospel Harmony compare the [German] works of Tholuck: *Credibility of the Gospel History* (against Strauss's *Life of Jesus*); Ebrard: *Criticism of the Evangelical History;* Thiersch: *On the Restoration of the historical standpoint*, etc.; Lex: *The Gospel Harmony on the Life of Jesus* (Wiesbaden, 1855). Also the *Lives of Jesus* by Neander, Hase, Lange, and J. Zeller: *Voices of the German Church on Strauss's Life of Jesus.* [Engl. works: Macknight, Campbell, Greswell, Robinson, Strong: on the *Gospel Harmony;* Westcott: *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels* (1862); Ebrard: *The Gospel History* (Edinb. trsl., 1863); Ellicott, and Andrews: *The Life of Christ.*—P. S.]

II. *The Book of Acts.*

The Book of Acts may also be arranged under four sections. 1. We have the apostolic Church, as the preparation and foundation of the one primeval Church for all the world,—embracing all nations and tongues (ch. i. and ii.); 2. The Jewish Christian Church (with Jerusalem as its metropolis, and Peter as its representative), tending toward the Gentile world and the Gentile Church (ch. iii. to xii.); 3. The Gentile Christian Church (with Antioch as its metropolis, and Paul as its representative), tending toward the Jewish Christian Church (ch. xiii. to xxv. 12); 4. The removal of any temporary difference by a higher unity, commencing with the journey of the Apostle Paul to Rome, and in the church at Rome, where the Jewish Christian and the Gentile Christian elements appear combined.

The modern assaults on the credibility of the Acts are refuted by Lechler: *The Apostolic and post-Apostolic Age;* Dietlein: *Das Urchristenthum;* Schaff and Lange: *History of the Apostolic Age*, and in part by Baumgarten in his Commentary on Acts. [Also in Wieseler: *Chronology of the Apostolic Age*, 1848.—P. S.]

* [Omitted in the Edinb. trsl.—P. S.]

§ 3.

THE DIDACTIC PORTION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, OR, THE EPISTLES.

"As the historical writings of the New Testament form a τετράμορφον εὐαγγέλιον, so a similar τετράμορφον (to use an ancient ecclesiastical expression), a τετράμορφος ἀπόστολος, might, so to speak, be traced in its parenetic portions" (Guericke, *Isagogics*, p. 216). This writer then proceeds to compare Matthew with James, Mark with Peter, Luke with Paul, and the Gospel with the Epistles of John. So also substantially Neander, Schmid, Schaff.

The didactic portion of the New Testament consists of epistles addressed to particular churches (epistles in the narrower sense), and general or catholic epistles addressed to the whole Church, or to a larger section of it. (On the various interpretations of the word καθολικός, comp. the Introductions). The writings of Paul, although belonging to the former class, might also be termed catholic, as they successively extend over every department of Christian life. Thus 1. *Eschatological* Epistles: the two Epistles to the Thessalonians, which treat of the doctrine of the last things; 2. *Ecclesiastic* Epistles: the two Epistles to the Corinthians, which treat of the organization and discipline of the Church; 3. *Soteriological* Epistles: the Epistle to the Galatians, which treats of the doctrine of redemption, presenting the righteousness by faith in contrast with the spurious righteousness by works; while the Epistle to the Romans exhibits this same righteousness in its nature and effects, in opposition to sin and its consequences. 4. *Christological* Epistles: the Epistle to the Philippians, which shows the exaltation of Christ in and by His humiliation, forms a transition between the previous epistles and those which treat of the *Person of Christ*, more especially the Epistles to the Colossians, and to the Ephesians. The Epistle to the Colossians commences by presenting the eternal and inherent glory which Christ possessed before all time, and then presents Him as the sole object of our faith; while the Epistle to the Ephesians commences with the final glory of Christ at the termination of all time, and presents Him as the only goal of the Church, and as forming the grand bond of its unity. 5. Lastly, we have the *Pastoral* Epistles: among which we include, besides the two Epistles to Timothy and that to Titus, the Epistle to Philemon.

The Epistle to the Hebrews must, on account of its general tenor, be classed with the Catholic Epistles, although, from its origin and character, it evidently claims kindred to those of Paul. We have thus three series of Catholic Epistles. The Epistle to the Hebrews, and that of James, express the relation in which the Church universal, but especially the Jewish Christian Church, stands to the Old Testament (to the ceremonial and the moral law), with the view of warning against apostasy and Judaizing tendencies. The three Epistles of John exhibit the relationship between the Church and the present state of things: 1. The fellowship of believers in Christ; 2. The proper limits of that fellowship,—the necessity of avoiding heretics; 3. The proper extent of that fellowship,—avoiding a spirit of separatism. Lastly, the Epistles of Peter and of Jude treat mainly of the relationship of the Church to the future.

§ 4.

THE PROPHETIC PORTION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

The Book of Revelation contains a prophetic description of the second advent of the Lord, and of the manifestation of His new creation and the transformation of the world, which is to be brought about by a series of great conflicts and triumphs of Christ over Antichrist and over the world. The description of this new work of creation opens with the Sabbath of redemption (hence the prophet has his vision on the Lord's Day), and extends to the eternal Sabbath of final completion. Accordingly, we also have the sacred number seven, seven times repeated—the seven churches, the seven seals, the seven trumpets, the seven thunders, the seven vials, and the seven heads of Antichrist. At the close, we have the manifestation of the seven Spirits of God—who throughout have guided the struggle (ch. i.)—in the appearance of Christ and the transformation of the world: a new genesis, by which the Bible at its conclusion points back to its commencement, showing how final and perfect fulfilment had now been attained.

THIRD SECTION.

GENERAL HOMILETICAL INTRODUCTION.

§ 1.

THE PLACE OF HOMILETICS.

One of the main duties of the pastoral office is preaching, as this work is more clearly defined by practical theology. The latter science, however, embraces more than that special department. It gives the theory of ecclesiastical life and Christian fellowship, and of its cultivation, or of edification, and treats, according to the teaching of Paul (1 Cor. xii. 4–6),—1. Of the Charismata in the Church; 2. of ecclesiastical offices; 3. of ecclesiastical functions. Among these, public worship occupies the most prominent place; and again, in public worship the preaching of the word, for which homiletics supplies the rules. Public worship is the *real* (not symbolical) and *direct* outward manifestation of the life of the Church in Christ its Head; while, at the same time, it also serves to deepen and to extend that life. The former of these objects is attained more especially by what may be designated the liturgical services, or prayer and praise, while the latter is aimed at by means of the sermon.

Based upon the eternal Word of God, and derived from it, the sermon is intended to advance the spiritual life of the Church *in its individual members*,—its lessons being always pointed with special reference to the present state and requirements of Christians, and to their ultimate calling. The rules for the proper discharge of this New Testament prophetical office are laid down in the science of Homiletics, or the sacred Art of Religious Discourse.

§ 2.

CHARACTER AND PRINCIPLES OF HOMILETICS.

Christian Homiletics is the evangelical churchly application of Rhetorics to sacred purposes. The homiletic oration is addressed to the spiritual feelings and interests of men, in divine wisdom and simplicity, and with spiritual motives, in order either to enlist them for those spiritual purposes which form the one grand aim of man, or else to quicken their spiritual life. From this it follows, that we shall have to dispense with all the mere outward artifices of secular rhetorics—many of which are dishonest, and to present our theme in a simple, yet well arranged, lively and effective address.

From this we may derive the following fundamental rules of Homiletics.

1. The sermon occupies a place intermediate between the eternal Word of God and the present requirements of the Church. On this ground, it must neither be merely a practical exposition of Scripture, nor yet merely a practical address adapted to the wants of the moment. It must combine these two elements, and at the same time serve to quicken, to sanctify, and to further develop the inner life, from the Word of God.

2. This application of the Word of God to the state and wants of the Church, is entrusted to the believing hearts of a properly trained ministry. Accordingly, the sermon must bear evidence both of personal piety and of intellectual individuality, or rather, this intellectual individuality must appear consecrated by devotion to the altar.

3. The sermon is addressed to a real church,—not a perfect church, but yet to a *church*. On this ground, it must proceed on the assumption that there are spiritual principles and sympathies to which it can appeal, whilst at the same time keeping in view and seeking to remove existing obstacles and objections. It must therefore avoid the extreme of being merely an appeal to the unconverted (a λόγος προτρεπτικός), while, on the other hand, it eschews mere indirect and pointless "speaking with tongues" (γένη γλωσσῶν). It must ascertain the exact spiritual state of the congregation, and, in accordance therewith, progress from conviction to joy and thanksgiving. Nor should it ever be forgotten that the sermon forms part of worship, and that, while in its character and purpose prophetic, it is also essentially devotional. Hence the sermon must be neither noisy nor drawling; noise in the pulpit runs counter to the dignity of worship, and to that of Christianity itself. Conversion is not to be confounded with nervous excitement; it implies a state when the soul is moved indeed to its inmost depths, yet calmed in Christ. As for drawling, it is entirely out of place in the pulpit. Singing should be left to the congregation; and the moment the sermon rises into musical festivity, it should close.

4. The sermon is addressed to a congregation, not to students. Hence, it must be popular, clear, pointed, and practical,—avoiding obscurity, confusion, and abstract propositions. On the other hand, it must be simple, direct, lively, yet sufficiently dignified. It must have sprung from prayer and meditation, from communion with the Lord and with His Word, and from deep sympathy with the spiritual state and the wants of the congregation.

5. The sermon is addressed to an evangelical church, *i. e.*, a church called to the freedom of the Spirit. Hence it is to be a homily, in the ancient sense of the term;

i. e., an interchange between the mind of the preacher and the spiritual views of the congregation, which cannot be obtained by mere persuasion, far less by outward or authoritative injunction, excluding all liberty, but by communion and fellowship of life. The homily is, so to speak, query and reply. Yet it were a mistake to rebut every objection which might possibly be raised, instead of replying to the queries which would naturally arise in the mind of the audience. These enquiries must be answered not with the wisdom of man, but by the Word of God.

6. The sermon is an official address delivered to the Church in the name and by the authority of the Head of the Church. Hence its name, Preaching,—*prædicatio*, declaration. Accordingly, the testimony of the truth must be supported by evidence; nor must it be of the nature of mere philosophical demonstration, which, of course, is incapable of being *preached*. Nor, lastly, would it be right to substitute for this testimony a mere asseveration: the testimony of the heart is to be combined with argument addressed to the mind.

7. The sermon is to *edify*. It is intended to *build up* the living temple with living stones; *i.e.*, to promote *spiritual communion*, and thereby *to quicken Christians*.

8. The construction of the sermon depends upon an exercise of the mind, which in turn presupposes meditation, prayer, and theological and religious knowledge. For the regulation of this exercise of the mind, Homiletics lays down certain rules about the *invention* of the theme, its *division*, and the *execution* and *delivery* of the discourse itself.

---

§ 3.

ECCLESIASTICAL AND MATERIAL HOMILETICS.

That which gives to the sermon its value, is the Word of the living God, which is laid down objectively in the Scriptures, and expressed and applied by the preacher in a subjectve form.

The central point of the Word of God, and its grand, all-embracing personality, is the eternal and historical Christ with His finished work. In the Person of the God-Man revelation and redemption are united, and revelation itself becomes redemption; there the Law and the Gospel meet, and the Law itself becomes Gospel; there doctrine and history meet, and doctrine itself becomes history; there the Church and the Scriptures meet, and the Church itself presents the epistles read and known of all men; there the Church and the believing heart meet, the Church being in Him of one heart and one soul; lastly, there justification and sanctification are united, and sanctification becomes a justification for the day of judgment. With all this we wish to impress upon our readers that the mystery of revelation must be preached, not as a matter of speculation, but with a view to its grand teleological object—the salvation of sinners; that the Old Testament must be explained according to the analogy of the New; that doctrine must be illustrated by life, and the confessions of the Church regulated by the Divine Scripture; that the Church must be built up by seeking the conversion and personal holiness of souls; and that justification by faith must ever be presented along with its final aim—the glorification of saints.

The main point which the preacher should keep in view is, that the great object of Christianity is to bring us into personal relationship to the risen Saviour, that is,

into blessed fellowship, through Him, with the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

The selection of a suitable subject for the sermon may be determined, 1, by the order of the Church universal, as it presents itself in the ecclesiastical year with its great festivals; 2, by the traditional or a new series of Gospels and Epistles for the day; 3, by the directions of the authorities of the particular national or state-Churches; 4, by the order of Synods and consistories; 5, by the ordinary course of nature and its seasons; 6, by extraordinary events (*casualia*); 7, by the peculiar relation and condition of the pastor and the congregation; 8, by literary helps, concordances, commentaries, religious reading, etc., which facilitates the invention and preparation of matter for sermons.*

1. *The Order of the Church General. The Church Year.*

The Church year designates the Christian consecration of time to the service of God, whereby the cycle of seasons becomes the symbol and type of the cycle of the evangelical history, and of the great facts of redemption. The Greek and Roman Churches changed the whole secular time into a succession of holidays in the interest of an exclusive hierarchy and an external showy ceremonialism; and thus the holidays of saints gradually obscured and almost annihilated the holy day of the Lord, or the Christian sabbath. But the ancient Catholic and the evangelical Church year represents typically and really the sanctification of the year as a manifestation of, and preparation for, eternity. [The Church year, as observed in the evangelical churches of Germany and the Continent, in the Church of England, and their descendants in America, is a reformation, purification and simplification of the Catholic Church year; it omits most or all holidays of saints, martyrs and angels, and of the Virgin Mary, but retains the leading festivals which commemorate what God has done for us in the incarnation, the passion and death, the resurrection and ascension of Christ, and the outpouring of the Holy Ghost; thus making the festivals of Christmas, Easter, and Pentecost prominent, and restoring—at least in England and America—the weekly festival of the Christian Sabbath to its proper dignity and significance.—P. S.]

LITERATURE.—On the Christian Church year *see* the works of Fred. Strauss (Berlin, 1850), Lisco (Berlin, 1852), Alt (1851), Harnack (1854), Warner (1860), and Piper's *Evangelical Year-book*, published annually at Berlin since 1850. [Also the Liturgical works and collections of Daniel, Mone, Neale, etc., the Liturgies of the Church of England, and the Lutheran Churches of Europe and America, Ebrard's *Ref. Kirchenbuch*, the new Baden Liturgy, the Irvingite Liturgy, the new (provisional) Liturgy of the G. Ref. Church of the U. S. (Philad. 1857), Baird's *Collection of Presbyterian Liturgies* (New York, 1859), etc., etc. —P. S.]

2. *The Old and New Pericopes, or Scripture Lessons for the Sundays of the Year.*

On the history of perikopes *see* the article *Perikopen* in the Univers. Theol. Dictionary of Danz; [also the more recent one in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopædie*, vol. xi., p. 373–399, written by E. Ranke.—P. S.] Ranke: *Das kirchliche Perikopensystem.* Berlin, 1847. Alt: *Der christl. Cultus.* Berlin, 1851, sqq., 3 vols. Lisco: *Das christl. Kirchenjahr*, 4th ed., Berlin, 1852. Bobertag: *Das evangel. Kirchenjahr in sämmtlichen Perikopen des N. T.* Breslau, 1857. On modern selections of Scripture lessons: Ranke (Berlin, 1850), Suckow, and Nitzsch (*Bibl. Vorlesungen aus dem A. und N. T.* Bonn, 1846). *See* the list of the old series of perikopes at the close of the gen. introduction.

* [This last and all the following sections from 1—8 till § 4, are omitted in the Edinb. trsl.—P. S.]

3. *National and State Churches.*

These have appointed in different countries of Europe a festival of the Reformation. [In Germany it is celebrated October 31, the day when Luther affixed the 95 theses on the doors of the castle church at Wittenberg, in 1517.—P. S.] Also political festivals, [coronation of kings, commemoration of royal birthdays; in the Church of England, the commemoration of the death of King Charles I., and of the Gunpowder Plot,—now abolished and omitted from the Common-Prayer Book.—P. S.] National fast and humiliation days. [Thanksgiving days annually recommended by the Governors of the different States of the United States of America, especially in New England, and national thanksgiving, or fast days, recommended to the whole people by the President of the United States, e.g. by President Taylor, during the cholera in 1849, and several times by President Lincoln, during the civil war, especially on the 30th of April, 1863. But, owing to the separation of Church and State, Governors and Presidents cannot ordain and command, like European sovereigns, but simply recommend, the observance of Christian festivals. Nevertheless, such days are generally even better observed in America than in Europe, perhaps for the very reason that their observance is not made a matter of compulsion, but of freedom.—P. S.]

4. *Provincial Synods [Denominations] and Local Congregations.*

Missionary festivals, foreign and domestic. Laying of corner stones, and dedication of new churches, etc. Confirmations, communions, benedictions, solemnization of marriage, funerals. All these are not, strictly speaking, *casualia*, but occur in the ordinary course of religious and congregational life.

5. *Churchly Festivals of the Natural Seasons.*

New Year. Spring festival. Harvest festival. Sylvester, (close of the year, December 31).

6. *Extraordinary Events of Nature and of History (Casualia).*

Extraordinary days of humiliation and prayer, during seasons of pestilence, famine, and war (Comp. above sub No. 3), or of thanksgiving after the return of peace or some great national deliverance.

7. *Pastoralia.*

Ordination—, installation— sermons. Introductory and valedictory sermons. [Opening sermons at Classical and Synodical meetings, diocesan and general Conventions, Centenary and other commemorative discourses.—P. S.]

8. *Homiletical Helps.*

1. *Concordances*, verbal or real, or both, by Wichmann (1782), Schott (1827), Hauff (1828), Büchner (1776), continued and improved by Hübner (1837 and often), Bernhard (1850). [All these works are German.] Greek concordance by H. Bruder: Ταμεῖον τῶν τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης λέξεων. Lips., 1842. [Based upon an older work of Erasmus Schmid; contains all the words of the Greek N. T. in alphabetical

order with the passages where they occur; invaluable for reference.—P. S.] Hebrew concordance by Jul. Fürst: *Concordantiæ libror. V. T.* Lips., 1840. [Based upon Joh. Buxtorf, and as valuable for the Hebrew, as Bruder for the Greek T.—*English* Concordances: Alex. Cruden: *A complete Concordance to the Holy Scriptures of the O. and N. Test.*, first published in London, 1731, and often since, both in England, Scotland and America, in full and in abridged forms. Also: *The Englishman's Greek Concordance of the New Testament*, publ. by S. Bagster, London, and republ. by Harper & Br., New York, 1855,—a useful adaptation of Schmid's Greek Concordance to the study of the English Bible.—*The Englishman's Hebrew and Chaldee Concordance of the Old Test.*, etc., Lond. (Longman, Green, Brown, and Longmans), 1843, 2 vols.,—an equal adaptation of Buxtorf-Fürst to the English Bible.—P. S.]

2. *Lists of Texts.* Schuler: *Repertorium biblischer Texte und Ideen für Casual-Predigten und Reden.* Halle, 1820. Haupt: *Bibl. Casualtext-Lexicon*, 1826. [There are a number of English works of the kind with or without skeletons of sermons; but I have none within reach, and cannot now find their titles.—P. S.]

3. *Materials.* Homiletical Bible-works and collections of Sermons and Preachers' Manuals. *See* the list in Danz's and Winer's works on theol. Literature. Collection of Patristic sermons in Germ., trnsl. by Augusti (2 vols., 1830 and 1839). Luther's *Hauspostille* and *Kirchenpostille*. The older German sermons of Scriver, H. Müller, Val. Herberger, Rieger, and the more recent sermons of Reinhart, Dräseke, Harms, Schleiermacher, Nitzsch, Fr. Strauss [court chaplain at Berlin, died 1863], Tholuck, Jul. Müller, G. Dan. and Fr. W. Krummacher, Ludw. and Wm. Hofacker [brothers], Kapff [of Stutgart], Schenkel [of Heidelberg], Beck [of Tübingen], Steinmeyer, W. Hoffmann [both of Berlin], Stier, Liebner, van Osterzee [of Rotterdam, now of Utrecht], and many others.—[The best *English* pulpit orators are Jeremy Taylor, Rbt. South, Isaac Barrow, Jos. Butler, Tillotson, Whitefield, John Wesley, among the older, and Edward Irving, Melville, Robt. Hall, Chalmers, Guthrie, Caird, Hare, Trench, Archer Butler, Spurgeon, among the more recent. Of *American* preachers we mention Jonathan Edwards, Sam. Davies, John M. Mason, Bethune, Alexander (father and two sons) G. Spring, Skinner, Stockton, Durbin, Wayland, Lyman Beecher, Park, Bushnell, Phelps, H. Ward Beecher, etc., etc. The *French* pulpit is best represented by Bossuet, Bourdaloue, Massuet, among the Roman Catholics, and Saurin, Adolf Monod, and Vinet, among the Reformed.—P. S.] *

* [We add a more complete list of distinguished deceased American preachers, selected almost entirely from Dr. W. B. Sprague's *Annals of the American Pulpit*, arranged by denominations and in chronological order. The list is, of course, very incomplete, and a number of very eloquent and useful men are omitted, because they published nothing, or were poorly educated. The most eloquent preachers in the list are put in italics; those marked (*) have left behind them one or more volumes of sermons; those marked (†) have left nothing except in pamphlet form.—P. S.]

CONGREGATIONAL (Trinitarian).

*Thomas Hooker .... Died, 1647.
*Benjamin Wadsworth..... " 1737.
*Benjamin Coleman, D. D.. " 1747.
*_Jonathan Edwards_...... " 1758.
†John Hooker.............. " 1777.
†_Samuel Cooper, D. D._..... " 1783.
†_Joseph Bellamy, D. D._..... " 1790.
†Peter Thatcher, D. D....... " 1802.
*Charles Backus, D. D...... " 1803.
*David Tappan, D. D....... " 1803.
*Nathan Strong, D. D...... " 1816.
*_Timothy Dwight, D. D._... " 1817.
*Jesse Appleton, D. D...... " 1819.
†Samuel Spring, D. D....... " 1819.
*Joseph Lathrop, D. D..... " 1820.
*Samuel Worcester, D. D... " 1821.
*_David Osgood, D. D._...... " 1822.
*_Edward Payson, D. D._.... " 1827.
*_Ebenezer Porter, D. D._.... " 1834.
*Nathaniel Emmons, D. D.. " 1840.
†Leonard Woods, D. D. .... " 1854.
*Joshua Bates, D. D........ " 1854.
*_Lyman Beecher, D. D._... " 1863.

PRESBYTERIAN.

*Jonathan Dickinson....... Died, 1747.
†Aaron Burr............... " 1757.
*_Samuel Davies_.......... " 1761.
*_Gilbert Tennent_.......... " 1764.
†Samuel Finley, D. D....... Died, 1766.
*Jonathan Parsons......... " 1776.
*_John Witherspoon, D. D._.. " 1794.
†Samuel Buell, D. D........ " 1798.
†_John Blair Smith, D. D._... " 1799.
†_John Blair Linn, D. D._.... " 1804.
*_Samuel Stanhope Smith, D. D., LL. D._.......... " 1819.
*_Sylvester Larned_........ " 1820.
*John B. Romeyn, D. D.... " 1825.
*_John Mitchell Mason, D. D._................ " 1829.
†John Holt Rice, D. D...... " 1831.
*_William Nevins, D. D._.... " 1835.
*_Edward Dorr Griffin, D. D._................ " 1837.
*_Daniel A. Clark_.......... " 1840.
†_John Breckenridge, D. D._ " 1841.
*James Richards, D. D..... " 1843.
*Ashbel Green, D. D....... " 1848.
†Samuel Miller, D. D....... " 1850.
*_Archibald Alexander, D. D._... .... " 1851.
*Erskine Mason, D.D....... " 1851.
*_Ichabod Smith Spencer, D. D._........ .... " 1854.
*Philip Lindsley, D. D..... " 1855.
*James W. Alexander, D. D................. " 1859.
†Nicholas Murray, D. D.... " 1861.
*Jos. Addison Alexander, D. D.................. Died, 1860.

EPISCOPALIAN.

†Samuel Johnson, D. D..... Died, 1772.
*Rt. Rev. Samuel Seabury, D. D.................. " 1796.
†Rt. Rev. John Henry Hobart, D. D.............. " 1830.
*_Gregory Townsend Bedell, D. D._.................. " 1834.
*Rt. Rev. William White, D. D.................. " 1836.
†Samuel Farmar Jarvis, D. D., LL. D.......... " 1851.

BAPTIST.

*_Samuel Stillman, D. D._.... Died, 1807.
*_Jonathan Maxcy, D. D._.... " 1820.
†Richard Furman, D. D. ... " 1825.
†Thomas Baldwin, D. D. ... " 1826.
†_William Staughton, D. D._ " 1829.
*_William Theophilus Brantley, D. D._........ " 1845.
*Wm. Parkinson..... ..... " 1848.
†_Spencer H. Cone_.......... " 1855.

METHODIST.

*Thomas Coke, LL. D...... Died, 1804.
†_Francis Asbury_......... " 1816.

§ 4.

PASTORAL OR FORMAL HOMILETICS.

Finding of the Subject.—This evidently depends on the above-mentioned traditions of the church year, etc., and on circumstances which cannot be prescribed or induced from without. Standing between the Word of God and the special wants of his congregation, the minister must choose his theme according to his spiritual perception and peculiar disposition at the time. However obvious in the circumstances a text may appear, yet the theme is always a discovery, or rather a gift from the Lord, a message to the Church, which can only be obtained or understood by prayer and meditation, by inward labor and spiritual meditation.

Division.—The sermon itself is the organic and artistic unfolding of the theme, showing the living connection between the text and the peculiar wants and circumstances of the congregation.

The *theme* of the discourse constitutes the fundamental idea of the sermon, and, accordingly, must pervade the whole. It is generally expressed in a short, definite proposition (which accordingly is frequently called the theme). The theme must embody both the cause and the object of the discourse; *i.e.*, it must have a divine basis, and at the same time a divine aim, although, in the proposition, either the cause or the object may be more prominently brought forward. The different parts of the sermon naturally flow from the theme. It is the object of the *introduction* to prepare the audience for the theme. Again, the subject must be presented in a lucid manner. This is the object of the proposition and of the division. The *execution* aims at presenting the theme in all its fulness. Lastly, the subject is summed up and applied in the *conclusion*. The general object and benefit of the *delivery* is, that in it the living truth is directly communicated to the living soul.

The homily, in the narrower sense (or the familiar expository lecture), differs from the sermon, in that it follows not so much the logical order of the theme, as the order of the text, which in this case is generally a larger portion of Scripture. In the sermon, the main contents of the text are compressed and expressed in the theme and in its proposition, and afterward systematically expounded in the various parts of the discourse. The distinction commonly made, of *analytical* and

**John Summerfield*....... Died, 1825.
†Wilbur Fisk, D. D....... " 1839.
**Henry Bidleman Bascom, D. D.*.................. " 1850.
**Stephen Olin, D.D., LL.D.* " 1851.
†Elijah Hedding, D. D...... " 1852.
**William Capers, D. D.*... " 1855.

DUTCH REFORMED.

*Theodore Jacobus Frelinghuysen................ Died, 1751.
**William Linn, D. D.*.... " 1808.
†John N. Abeel, D. D....... " 1812.
†John Henry Livingston, D. D................... " 1825.
†John Melanchthon Bradford, D. D............ " 1826.
†John De Witt, D. D...... " 1831.
†Philip Milledoler, D. D... " 1852.
†Jacob Brodhead, D. D.... " 1855.

GERMAN REFORMED.

†Michael Schlatter......... Died, 1790.
*Charles Becker, D. D..... " 1818.
*Augustus Rauch, P. D.... " 1841.

EVANG. LUTHERAN.

†Henry Melchior Mühlenberg.................. Died, 1787.
†Justus Henry Christian Helmuth, D. D......... " 1838.
†Carl Rudolph Demme, D. D.................... " 1868.

REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN.

†James McKinney......... Died, 1804.
**Alexander McLeod, D. D.* " 1833.
†Gilbert McMaster, D. D.... " 1854.

ASSOCIATE REFORMED.

**James Gray, D. D.*........ Died, 1824.
**Alexander Proudfit, D. D.* Died, 1843.
†J. M. Duncan, D. D....... " 1851.

UNITARIAN.

**Jonathan Mayhew, D. D.*. Died, 1766.
*John Clarke, D. D........ " 1798.
**Joseph Stephens Buckminster*................ " 1812.
*Samuel Cooper Thacher... " 1817.
*Abiel Abbott, D. D. (of Beverly)................. " 1828.
*James Freeman, D. D..... " 1835.
†John Thornton Kirkland, D. D.................. " 1840.
**William Ellery Channing, D. D.*............ " 1842.
**Henry Ware, Jr., D. D.*.. " 1843.
**Francis William Pitt Greenwood, D. D.*...... " 1843.
*W. B. O. Peabody, D. D... " 1847.

synthetical discourses, is apt to mislead. Even the most analytical homily must be one in its idea and aim, otherwise it degenerates into a mere accidental exposition; while the so-called synthetic or systematic sermon also must ever unfold the teaching of the word, if it is to be a sermon, and not merely a religious address. As intermediate between the homily and the sermon, we may mention those compositions in which the two elements are combined, homiletic sermons and systematic homilies.

The theme must be expressed in the proposition, briefly, clearly, strikingly, yet simply and not artificially. According to the text, or the circumstances of the case, or the state of the audience or of the speaker, it may be expressed either in a positive sentenec, or in the form of a query, or of an inscription; in which latter case it resembles more closely the ancient homily, or the mental interchange between the congregation and the preacher.

Uniformity in presenting the subject would indicate a want of living interchange of thought with the people—a kind of dead scholasticism and formalism, unsuited to the pulpit. The same remark holds true in reference to the division, which must not be determined simply according to the syntactic arrangement of the sentence, but flow from the subject by an interchange of thought and feeling between the preacher and the hearers.

The division of the sermon will therefore vary with our varying aim. Still, it is always necessary to observe logical order, which may be expressed in the following rules. The division must, 1, embrace no more than the theme; 2, it must exhaust the theme; 3, it must arrange it according to its essential synthetic parts; 4, it must express the regular progress of these parts, from the cause to the final object, from the ἀρχή to the τέλος.

Execution.—The same rules are here to be observed. The subject must be properly grouped, without, however, allowing this arrangement to appear too prominently. So far as style is concerned it behoves us to remember that ours is sacred oratory, and that the effects aimed at are spiritual in their nature. Accordingly, we must equally avoid the extreme of vulgar familiarity, and that of philosophic pomposity or of flowery poetry.

Delivery.—Here also art comes into play. The delivery of the discourse, in reference both to what is *heard* and what is *seen* (declamation and action), must not be rude nor unstudied. On the other hand, it must be free from extravagance or affectation. It must be natural, in the sense of corresponding to and expressing the subject treated, and yet distinctive, according to the individuality of the preacher, always bearing in mind that he is but the minister of the word.

LITERATURE.*—The principal writers on *Practical Theology* are Baxter, Burk, Schwarz, Köster, Marheineke, Hüffell, Harms, Gaupp, Nitzsch, Schleiermacher, Moll, Ebrard. The chief works on *Homiletics* are those of Schott [translated in part by Dr. Park in earlier vols. of the *Bibliotheca Sacra.*—P. S.], Theremin [trsl. by Dr. Shedd.—P. S.], Stier, Alex. Schweizer, Palmer, Baur, Vinet [trsl. by Dr. Skinner.—P. S.]. On the *History of Pulpit Eloquence*, we refer to the works of Schuler, Ammon, Schmidt, Paniel, and Lentz, also Beyer: *Das Wesen per christl. Predigt*, 1861, and Kirsch: *Die populäre Predigt*, 1861. [Comp. Henry C. Fish: *History and Repository of Pulpit Eloquence* (a collection of the masterpieces of the greatest preachers of different ages and denominations, with biographical sketches, and a masterly introductory essay by Dr. Park, of Andover), New York, 1857, 3 vols.—P. S.]

* [Omitted in the Edinb. trsl.—P. S.]

FOURTH SECTION.

HOMILETICAL INTRODUCTION TO THE NEW TESTAMENT.

THE rules which we have already given apply specially to the homiletical treatment of the New Testament. It may be considered a mark of progress, that in our days, more than in the ancient Church, the New Testament is chosen as the subject of exposition; although, on the other hand, Socinian and Rationalistic views may have led to a depreciation of the Old Testament. In opposition to any such tendency, it is sufficient to remark, that the Apostles themselves based their teaching upon the Old Testament, and that the saying of Paul, in 2 Tim. iii. 16, applies to all times. Deeper and more spiritual views of the New Testament as the fulfilment of the Old, and that of all prophecies of creation and of ancient history, will lead us, in expounding the New Testament, ever to refer to the Old, and thus to enrich and explain, to enlarge and to quicken, our addresses. The point to be always kept in mind is this, that in Christ alone is all fulness.

LITERATURE.*—1. *Homiletical and Practical Commentaries on the New Testament.* C. H. Rieger: *Betrachtungen über das N. T. zum Wachsthum in der Gnade und Erkenntniss Jesu Christi.* Tübingen, 1828, 2 vols. Heubner: *Praktische Erklärung des N. T.* Potsdam, 1860, sqq. Besser: *Bibelstunden.* Halle, 1854, sqq. Mad. Guyon: *La Ste. Bible, avec des explications.* Amsterd., 1713–'15, 20 vols. Also the commentaries of Bengel, Bogatzky, Gossner. [The best English commentators for *homiletical* and *practical* use are Henry, Scott, Gill, Doddridge, Burkitt, Barnes (Hodge on the *Romans*). Comp. also David Brown and others: *A Commentary, Critical, Experimental, and Practical, on the Old and New Testaments.* Glasgow and London, 1863 sqq.—P. S.]

2. Expositions of the *Pericopes*, or *Gospels and Epistles* for the year. A large number of German sermon books of Herberger, Rambach, Harms, Stier, the two Hofackers, Kapff, Hirscher (R. Cath.), Lisco, etc.

* [Omitted in the Edinb. trsl.—P. S.]

APPENDIX.—Table of the Ancient Scripture Lessons, or Gospels and Epistles for the Sundays of the Year.*

	The Gospels.	The Epistles.
1. Advent	Matt. xxi. 1-9.	Rom. xiii. 11-14.
2. "	Luke xxi. 25-36.	Rom. xv. 4-13.
3. "	Matt. xi. 2-10.	1 Cor. iv. 1-5.
4. "	John i. 19-28.	Phil. iv. 4-7.
1. Christmas	Luke ii. 1-14.	Tit. ii. 11-14. (Isa. ix. 2-7.)
2. "	Luke ii. 15-40.	Tit. iii. 4-7.
(St. Stephen's Day)	Matt. xxiii. 34-39.	Acts vi. 8-vii. 2.
3. Christmas	John i. 1-14.	Hebr. i. 1-12.
(St. John's Day)	John xxi. 20-24.	1 John i.
Sunday after Christmas	Luke ii. 33-40.	Gal. iv. 1-7.
New Year's Day; Circumcision	Luke ii. 21.	Gal. iii. 23-29.
Sunday after New Year	Matt. ii. 13-23.	1 Pet. iv. 12-19.
Epiphany	Matt. ii. 1-12.	Isa. lx. 1-6.
1. Sunday after Epiphany	Luke ii. 41-52.	Rom. xii. 1-6.
2. Sunday after Epiphany	John ii. 1-11.	Rom. xii. 7-16.
3. Sunday after Epiphany	Matt. viii. 1-13.	Rom. xii. 17-21.
4. Sunday after Epiphany	Matt. viii. 23-27.	Rom. xiii. 8-10.
5. Sunday after Epiphany	Matt. xiii. 24-30.	Col. iii. 12-17.
6. Sunday after Epiphany	Matt. xvii. 1-9.	2 Pet. i. 16-21.
Septuagesima	Matt. xx. 1-16.	1 Cor. ix. 24-x. 5.
Sexagesima	Luke viii. 4-15.	2 Cor. xi. 19-xii. 9.
Estomihi †	Luke xviii. 31-43.	1 Cor. xiii.
Invocavit	Matt. iv. 1-11.	2 Cor. vi. 1-10.
Reminiscere	Matt. xv. 21-28.	1 Thess. iv. 1-7.
Oculi	Luke xi. 14-28.	Eph. v. 1-9.
Lætare	John vi. 1-15.	Gal. iv. 21-31.
Judica	John viii. 46-59.	Hebr. ix. 11-15.
Palm Sunday	Matt. xxi. 1-9.	Phil. ii. 5-11.
Mounday Thursd'y	John xiii. 1-15.	1 Cor. xi. 23-32.
Good Friday	History of the Passion.	Isa. liii.
1. Easter	Mark xvi. 1-8.	1 Cor. v. 6-8.
2. "	Luke xxiv. 13-35.	Acts x. 34-41.
3. "	Luke xxiv. 36-47.	Acts xiii. 26-33.
1. Sunday after Easter (Quasimodog.)	John xx. 19-31.	1 John v. 4-10.
2. Sunday after Easter (Miser. Dom.)	John x. 12-16.	1 Pet. ii. 21-25.
3. Sunday after Easter (Jubilate)	John xvi. 16-23.	1 Pet. ii. 11-20.
4. Sunday after Easter (Cantate)	John xvi. 5-15.	James i. 16-21.
5. Sunday after Easter (Rogate)	John xvi. 23-30.	James i. 22-27.
Ascension Day	Mark xvi. 14-20.	Acts i. 1-11.
6. Sunday after Easter (Exaudi)	John xv. 26-xvi. 4.	1 Pet. iv. 8-11.

	The Gospels.	The Epistles.
1. Pentecost	John xiv. 23-31.	Acts ii. 1-13.
2. "	John iii. 16-21.	Acts x. 42-46.
3. "	John x. 1-11.	Acts viii. 14-17.
Trinity Sunday	John iii. 1-15.	Rom. xi. 33-36.
1. Sunday after Trinity	Luke xvi. 19-31.	1 John iv. 16-21.
2. Sunday after Trinity	Luke xiv. 16-24.	1 John iii. 13-18.
3. Sunday after Trinity	Luke xv. 1-10.	1 Pet. v. 6-11.
4. Sunday after Trinity	Luke vi. 36-42.	Rom. viii. 18-23.
5. Sunday after Trinity	Luke v. 1-11.	1 Pet. iii. 8-15.
6. Sunday after Trinity	Matt. v. 20-26.	Rom. vi. 3-11.
7. Sunday after Trinity	Mark viii. 1-9.	Rom. vi. 19-23.
8. Sunday after Trinity	Matt. vii. 15-23.	Rom. viii. 12-17.
9. Sunday after Trinity	Luke xvi. 1-9.	1 Cor. x. 6-13.
10. Sunday after Trinity	Luke xix. 41-48.	1 Cor. xii. 1-11.
11. Sunday after Trinity	Luke xviii. 9-14.	1 Cor. xv. 1-10.
12. Sunday after Trinity	Mark vii. 31-37.	2 Cor. iii. 4-11.
13. Sunday after Trinity	Luke x. 23-37.	Gal. iii. 15-22.
14. Sunday after Trinity	Luke xvii. 11-19.	Gal. v. 16-24.
15. Sunday after Trinity	Matt. vi. 24-34.	Gal. v. 25-vi. 10.
16. Sunday after Trinity	Luke vii. 11-17.	Eph. iii. 13-21.
17. Sunday after Trinity	Luke xiv. 1-11.	Eph. iv. 1-6.
18. Sunday after Trinity	Matt. xxii. 34-46.	1 Cor. i. 4-9.
19. Sunday after Trinity	Matt. ix. 1-8.	Eph. iv. 22-28.
20. Sunday after Trinity	Matt. xxii. 1-14.	Eph. v. 15-21.
21. Sunday after Trinity	John iv. 47-54.	Eph. vi. 10-17.
22. Sunday after Trinity	Matt. xviii. 23-35.	Phil. i. 3-11.
23. Sunday after Trinity	Matt. xxii. 15-22.	Phil. iii. 17-21.
24. Sunday after Trinity	Matt. ix. 18-26.	Col. i. 9-14.
25. Sunday after Trinity	Matt. xxiv. 15-28.	1 Thess. iv. 13-18.
26. Sunday after Trinity	Matt. xxv. 31-46.	2 Pet. iii. 3-14.
27. Sunday after Trinity	Matt. xxv. 1-13.	1 Thess. v. 1-11.

* [This Table is likewise omitted in the Edb. trsl. But as it belongs to the homiletical character of this Commentary and is frequently referred to in the Homiletical sections, we have retained it with the exception of the Apostles' Days, and Days of the Virgin Mary, which are very rarely observed among Protestants. The old series of Gospels and Epistles is essentially the same in the Rom. Cath., Luth., Episcop., and Germ. Reform. Churches with a few variations. Compare the Tables in the Episc. Common Prayer Book, in the Germ. Ref. Liturgy of 1857, pp. 30-33, and in many Lutheran and Reformed Liturgies and Hymn Books.—P. S.]

† [This and the following Latin titles are the initial words of the introductory Latin Psalms appointed for these several Sundays in the Latin Church.—P. S.]

I.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MATTHEW;

OR,

THE GOSPEL OF THEOCRATIC HISTORY

(*SYMBOLIZED BY THE SACRIFICIAL BULLOCK.*)

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. DISTINCTIVE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE FIRST GOSPEL.

The genealogy at the beginning of the Gospel of Matthew is of the greatest importance. The first Gospel connects the New Testament most intimately with the Old, not by an index of the writings of the Old Testament, but by the Old Testament genealogy of Jesus. This serves as evidence of the indissoluble connection between the Old and the New Testament, which continued in the secret recesses of Jewish life even during the age of the Apocrypha. It expresses at the same time the important truth, that God's revelation was carried on not only by the spoken and written word, but also, and chiefly, in and by the seed of Abraham, through a succession of living men, until it reached its climax in the personal incarnation, in Christ.

In the Gospel by Matthew, the life of Jesus is presented as forming part of the history and life of the Jewish nation; and hence as the fulfilment of the hereditary blessing of Abraham. Jesus is here set before us as the new-born King of the Jews, as the promised Messiah, and the aim and goal of every progressive stage of the Theocracy. He is the great Antitype of Old Testament history, in whom everything has been fulfilled—the types in the law, in worship, in historical events, and in gracious interpositions—in short, the fulfilment of the Theocracy. In and with Him the Old Covenant is transformed into the New, the Theocracy into the kingdom of heaven, the demands of the law into the beatitudes, Sinai into the Mount of Beatitudes, the prophetic into the teaching office, the priesthood into redemption by suffering, and the kingship into the triumph of almighty grace, restoring, helping, and delivering a fallen world.

But as Christ formed both the central truth and the crown of the entire history of the Old Covenant, His life, and the perfect revelation of God in Him, were necessarily opposed to the carnal and spurious form which Judaism had assumed in that age, or the historical traditionalism of the Scribes. This claimed to expound the full import of the law of Moses, and assumed the appearance of strictest conformity to its requirements, but, in point of fact, it perverted the Old Testament into a series of outward ordinances, utterly destructive of the spirit of the law, and which from their very nature evoked scepticism on the one hand, and false spiritualism on the other, while they necessarily led to the decay of national life. The truth of this statement

appears but too clearly from the connection of the Judaism of the Pharisees and Scribes with the scepticism of the Sadducees, the false spiritualism of the Essenes, and the semi-heathen and semi-Jewish rule of Herod the Idumæan. This essential antagonism between true and false Judaism accounts for the persecution and the sufferings of the Christ of God. In truth, His life was a continuous conflict between the real and the spurious King of Israel, between the true Prophet and the spurious claims of the Scribes and Pharisees, between the true High Priest and a carnal priesthood. This contest issued in His death upon the cross.

Hence Christ is at the same time the heir of the blessing and the heir of the curse, which descended upon Him through the successive ages of history. Viewed in Himself, as the Son of God and the Son of Man, He is the great Heir of the blessing of Abraham, and of humanity in general; for from the first the human family was elected and blessed in Him. On the other hand, in His history,—*i. e.*, through the connection subsisting between His sinless divine-human Person and His guilty and sin-laden brethren,—the curse due, in the first place, to His people Israel, and in the next, to all mankind, is seen to descend and to meet upon Him. But by His world-conquering love, the curse of the cross became in turn the greatest of blessings, even the reconciliation of the world. The glorious fact, that by the death of Christ the reconciliation of the world had been accomplished, became immediately manifest in His resurrection. Hence He who, in the execution of His mission, was subject to every human condition and limitation, —who, during His earthly course, was despised and rejected of men, and in His death bore the concentrated weight of every curse, He, the image of God from heaven, for His great love cast down to hell by His blinded people, appears in His resurrection as the glorious and sovereign Lord and King, to whom all power is given in heaven and upon earth, and who gathers His elect from every nation and kindred.

The history of Jesus, as delineated by Matthew, is at the same time the fulfilment and the transformation of all history. If that Evangelist has given us chiefly the History of the gospel, he has also furnished the Gospel of history.

As here presented to our view, the Saviour not only sounds the depths of every sorrow, but also *transforms* it. It is this transformation of sorrow which constitutes the Priesthood of the Spirit. For, by His unconditional self-surrender, prompted by unspeakable love, the sacrificial Lamb became the eternal High Priest. The covenant blessing which Jesus had inherited as the Son of Abraham now opened up in all its fulness, and appeared as the fulfilment and the climax of every blessing hitherto vouchsafed to our earth. The *kingdom of heaven*—the eternal Canaan—was no longer confined to one spot, but all, of whatever nation or kindred, who were poor in spirit, and thus the true seed of Abraham, were to be admitted citizens of this spiritual and heavenly country.

From its prevailing historical character, the Gospel of Matthew may be regarded as forming the basis of all the others. It dwells chiefly on the great facts of the life of Jesus as foretold and foreshadowed in the Old Testament; while Mark sketches His individual personality, Luke presents Him in His mercy to humanity at large, and John, in his symbolical, divinely ideal Gospel, opens to our view the fulness of grace and of truth which came by Jesus Christ.

In its typological view and exposition of the Old Testament, the Gospel according to Matthew strongly resembles the Epistle to the Hebrews.

§ 2. MATTHEW THE EVANGELIST.

From his peculiar genius, his training, and his apostolical calling, Matthew Levi, the publican and Apostle, was peculiarly fitted for the task of writing this Gospel. In truth, his Gospel is just the embodiment of the faith and blissful joy which sprung up in his own heart from a view of the Lord and a survey of His history. What he saw and believed, he presents to his readers.

Before his conversion, Matthew was employed in collecting toll and custom by the Lake of Gennesaret (Matt. ix. 9 sq.). He is the same with "Levi, son of Alpheus," whom, according to Luke v. 27, 29; Mark ii. 14, the Lord called from the receipt of custom. For the special

calls of Christ in the Gospels refer always to the apostolic office, and besides this, only one of the Apostles—Matthew—had formerly been a publican. The change of name cannot be regarded as an objection, as several of the Apostles adopted a new name expressive of their altered views or calling. His old name, *Levi* (for Levite, לֵוִיִי), might either express the idea of Jewish legalism, or, from its etymology (לָוָה), attachment and dependence. The name *Matthew*, which he adopted, is not identical with *Matthias* (מַתִּתְיָה, Θεόδωρος or Θεόδοτος). The different formation of the word points to a different derivation. Besides, another of the disciples bore the name of *Nathanael*, or "gift of God." The word מְתַי signifies full extension or growth —*in concreto*, like מַת, one who is fully grown, a man, a hero: add to this the word *Jah*, and the name might be interpreted as meaning "God's free man," in opposition to *Levi*, the servant of the law. Such at least was Matthew, whatever may be deemed the right interpretation of his name.*

The great and gracious calling of Matthew from the receipt of custom to the apostolic office took place at a time when many publicans and sinners (or excommunicated persons) were awakened by the word of the Lord. Even before that, however, Matthew had been an "Israelite indeed," familiar and imbued with the spirit of the Old Testament. The circumstance that, although deeply attached to the religion of his fathers, he adopted an occupation against which such strong prejudices were entertained, would seem to indicate that, to some extent at least, he could distinguish between the true essence of Judaism and its outward forms and traditional prejudices. In his conversion, this distinction was fully impressed on his mind. Internal and external Judaism, spiritual and outward tradition, the fulfilment of genuine hope in Christ, and its perversion in the carnal expectations of the Jews,—such are the fundamental ideas of his Gospel, and set before his readers in that orderly, rubrical, business-like manner, to which he had been trained in the school of his former employment as a publican. This methodical arrangement of the subject, an aptitude for descrying and presenting any grand contrast in a striking manner, to which must be added a peculiar breadth of mind, formed the mental qualifications of our Evangelist for his work, which were still further developed in the school of grace.

The New Testament furnishes no details of his later activity as an Apostle. According to Eusebius (Hist. Eccles. iii. 24), Matthew proclaimed the Gospel first to the Hebrews, and then went to other nations, after having "committed his Gospel to writing in his native language" (the Hebrew). Later historians report that he had gone to Ethiopia (to Meroë), and there preached the Gospel (Socrates, Hist. Eccles. i. 19; Rufinus x. 9). According to the earlier statement of Clement of Alexandria (Strom. iv.), he died a natural death: later writers speak of his martyrdom † (Mart. Rom. 21 Sept. Abdiæ Hist. Ap. 7). Isidore of Seville represents him as laboring in Macedonia, Symeon Metaphrastes in Upper Syria, Ambrosius in Persia, and others in different places. But we attach no historical value to any of these notices, except those of Clement and Eusebius. According to an ancient tradition, Matthew remained in Jerusalem for fifteen years after the ascension of the Lord (Clement Alex. Strom. vi.).

Matthew and John alone have the honor of being at the same time Apostles and Evangelists. As Evangelist, our *publican* stands first in order, and opens the message of salvation, even as Mary Magdalene, who had been a *sinner*, was the first to bring tidings of the resurrection.

§ 3. COMPOSITION OF THIS GOSPEL.

1. As to the original *language* of the first Gospel, the most ancient and trustworthy witnesses record that Matthew wrote it in Hebrew. The testimonies to this effect commence with that of Papias of Hierapolis, at the beginning of the second century, who evidently refers to the written Gospel by Matthew (see Euseb. H. E. iii. 39). His statement is confirmed by

* For other derivations of the name, see Winer's *Bibl. Real-Wörterbuch.*

† The legend runs, that one of the attendants of Hirtacus, king of Ethiopia, murdered Matthew, by piercing him through the back while at prayer. The revenge of the king was prompted by the conversion of Ægyppus, his predecessor on the throne, who with his whole family, had adopted Christianity in consequence of the preaching of Matthew.

almost all the older Fathers, such as Irenæus, Origen, Eusebius, Jerome, and Epiphanius. On the other hand, however, an independent examination of our present Greek Gospel by Matthew, and especially of the independent form of his quotations from the Old Testament as compared with the Septuagint, leaves the impression of an original work, whether it was written by Matthew himself, or by some other person clothed with apostolic authority. Papias relates that this Gospel was repeatedly interpreted, and the apostolic Church undoubtedly retained its most trustworthy rendering. This translation was preserved in its purity, and obtained canonical authority; while the Hebrew original was afterwards corrupted and interpolated by the Jewish-Christian sects, and in this heretical form called the *Gospel of the Hebrews*, which lost or rather never enjoyed canonical authority. The whole tenor of the first Gospel proves, that it was originally destined for Jewish Christians. Matthew evidently assumes that his readers are conversant with the Old Testament, with the sacred writings, and with Palestine and its manners. If this view be correct, we also gather how different the tenets of the early Jewish Christians were from those of the later Ebionites. Christians who could appreciate his narrative would not afterwards confound the Gospel with legal and ceremonial traditionalism.

The genuineness of the first two chapters of this Gospel has been doubted, but without any good reason. We might as well separate the head from the body as call in question the chapters, which form the basis of the whole Gospel. Such doubts belong to a period, happily gone by, when commentators and critics had not the most remote conception of the fundamental ideas and the organic connection of the various Gospels.

2. *Time* of Composition.—From such passages as chaps. xxvii. 8, and xxviii. 15, we infer that this Gospel was composed a considerable time after the resurrection of Christ. Again, we may conjecture from chap. xxiv. 15, that it was written when the temple of Jerusalem was already, in a certain sense, desecrated by the "abomination of desolation." Of course it must date from before the destruction of Jerusalem, although that event was already foreshadowing. Hence we may date the Gospel of Matthew from the year 67 to 69.

3. *Authenticity.*—For the many testimonies in favor of the authenticity of this Gospel, we refer the reader to the various *Introductions*, especially to Kirchhofer's *Collection of Sources* (*Quellensammlung*) *for the History of the New Testament Canon* (Zur., 1842). Papias already knew this Gospel, the expression recorded by Eusebius (H. E. iii. 39) manifestly referring to a Gospel,—the word Λόγια applying to the *entire* evangelical tradition of Matthew, and not merely to a collection of sayings, as appears from the similar statement about Mark. The *Diatessaron* of Tatian, which dates from the middle of the second century, shows that at that time all the four Gospels had already been recognized by the Church; and it must be remembered that Tatian was a disciple of Justin, and that the *Memorabilia* (ἀπομνημονεύματα) point back to an earlier period. In the second half of the second century, the founder of the Catechetical School at Alexandria met with the Gospel of Matthew among the Arabs (Euseb. v. 10). The testimony of Irenæus (adversus hæres. iii. 1) dates from about the same period; after which we have the testimonies of Origen, Eusebius, Epiphanius, Jerome, and others.

4. *Title.*—As in the inscription to all the other Gospels, so in this also, the expression, *According to* Matthew (κατὰ Ματθαῖον), calls attention to the important fact, that, notwithstanding the human diversity appearing in the Gospels, they form but one Divine message of salvation.

§ 4. THEOLOGICAL AND HOMILETICAL TREATMENT OF THIS GOSPEL.*

We confine ourselves here to the special works on Matthew, having already noticed the general commentaries on the New Testament.

Among the older monographs on Matthew we mention MELANCHTHON: *Breves Commentarii in Matthæum*, Strasb., 1523; ŒCOLAMPADIUS: *Enarrationes in Evang. Matthæi*, Bas., 1536; and similar works of WOLFG. MUSCULUS, OLEARIUS, &c. Modern commentators of Matthew, in full or in part, are: GRIESBACH; WIZENMANN (*The History of Jesus according to Matth.*); MEN-

* [This whole section is omitted in the Edinb. edition.—P. S.]

KEN (*Meditations on the Gospel of M.*, 2 vols., Frankf., 1809; Bremen, 1822,—homiletical and practical); HARNACK (*Jesus the Christ, or the Fulfiller of the Law*, a bibl. theol. Essay on the basis of the Gospel of Matth., Elberf., 1842); THOLUCK [*Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount*, Matt. v.–vii., Hamburg, 1833, 3d ed., 1845; translated into English by R. L. BROWN, Edinb., 1860; it is regarded as the most elaborate and valuable exegetical work of Dr. Tholuck.—P. S.]; KLING (*The Sermon on the Mount*, Marburg, 1841); [FR. ARNDT, of Berlin, *Sermons on the Sermon on the Mount*, Magdeb., 1839, 2 vols.—P. S.;] LISCO [and especially TRENCH] on the *Parables*, and on the *Miracles of Jesus* (several editions); STIER (in the *Reden Jesu*) [*Words of Jesus*, vols. i. and ii., German and English]; HEUBNER (*Practical Com.*, vol. i.: *The Gospel of Matth.*, Potsdam, 1855); and the Roman Catholic divines: ARNOLDI (*The Gospel of Matth.*, Treves, 1856); SCHEGG (Munich, 1856); and BUCHER (Schaffhausen, 1855). Comp. also the critical essays of HARLESS: *De compositione Evang. quod Matthæo tribuitur* (Erlangen, 1842), and DELITZSCH: *On the Origin and Plan of Matth.* (Leipz., 1853); also the exegetical monograph of DORNER: *De oratione Christi eschatologica*, Stuttg., 1844 [on Matt. xxiv.].

For fuller lists of older writers on Matthew, see HEIDEGGER: *Enchiridion biblicum*, p. 464; WALCH, *Biblioth. theol.*, p. 463; DANZ: *Universalwörterbuch der theol. Literatur*, p. 636–'46, and the *Supplement*, p. 72 and 73; WINER: *Handbuch der theol. Lit.*, i., p. 245 sqq., *Supplement*, p. 38; and SCHMIDT: *Biblioth. theol.* (Halle, 1855), p. 36.

[*American* works on Matthew.—JOS. ADDISON ALEXANDER (O. S. Presbyt.): *The Gospel according to Matthew* (New York, 1861). The last work of the author, completed only to the close of chapter xvi.; with a short analysis of the remaining chapters which he finished a few days before his death. WILLIAM NAST (educated in the university of Tübingen, minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and editor of a German religious periodical in Cincinnati): *Kritisch-Praktischer Commentar über das N. T.*, vol. i. on Matthew (Cincinnati, 1860). It is now being translated into English under the supervision of the author. D. D. WHEDON (Method. Episc.): *A Commentary on the Gospels of Matthew and Mark, for popular use* (New York, 1861). T. J. CONANT (Baptist): *The Gospel by Matthew. The Common English Version and the Received Greek Text; with a Revised Version and Critical and Philological Notes;* prepared for the Amer. Bible Union (New York, 1860). Comp. also the popular Commentaries on the Gospels by A. BARNES (N. S. Presbyt.), Prof. OWEN (N. S. Presbyt.) and Prof. JACOBUS (O. S. Presbyt.), and ROBINSON'S and STRONG'S *Harmonies*.—P. S.]

§ 5. FUNDAMENTAL IDEA AND ORGANISM OF THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MATTHEW.

Jesus, the offspring of David, is the fulfilment of the Old Covenant. His doctrine and His life embody the essence and the spirit of the Old Testament Theocracy—Judaism is its fundamental idea and import,—thus proving that He was the promised Christ of God. But, on this very ground, His history presents a continual antagonism with the spurious and degenerate Judaism, represented by the hierarchy of His age. In this conflict, while outwardly succumbing, He achieves that triumph by which His eternal kingdom is established. He dies,—but as the great atoning sacrifice by which the world is reconciled to God; and this reconciliation constitutes the basis of His kingdom.

Viewed in this light, the Gospel of Matthew presents to us the fulfilment of the Old Covenant. It is the Gospel of the law, of the priesthood, of the genealogies, of history, of sufferings, and of death,—in a word, the Gospel of the promised and accomplished atonement, of the predicted and achieved triumph.

As fulfilling the Old Covenant, Jesus Christ transforms the typical Theocracy into the everlasting kingdom of heaven; and that in His capacity as *eternal Prophet*, *High Priest*, and *King*, —*i. e.*, as the true Christ.

Part First.

Jesus comes into this world, as the true theocratic Messiah, to fulfil the Old Covenant. He remains unknown to, and unrecognized by, the outward and worldly Theocracy of His day;

yea, he was rejected and cast out. Hence He is destined to undertake His Messianic pilgrimage in obscurity and humility; but He is glorified and attested by God.

1st Section.—Prophetic types of the Messiah in the genealogy of the Messiah (Ch. i. 1–17).

2d Section.—Jesus, as miraculously conceived by His mother in faith, or in the mystery of His incarnation, is not recognized even by the legitimate representative of the house of David (Joseph), till attested by an angel from heaven (Vers. 18–25).

3d Section.—On His appearance upon earth, He is rejected, despised, and persecuted by the theocratic city, the theocratic priesthood, and royalty; but owned by God in signs from heaven, in the adoration of wise men from the heathen world, in His miraculous and Divine preservation, effected by the flight into Egypt, and by His concealment during His youth in the obscurity of Galilee (Ch. ii.).

4th Section.—On entering upon His public ministry, Jesus remained still unknown, even to those who had humbled themselves and professed penitence in Israel. In the baptism unto repentance He receives His solemn consecration unto the death which He was to accomplish, while at the same time He is owned and glorified by the Father as His beloved Son,—the whole blessed Trinity shedding its lustre around Him, and His advent being announced by His special messenger, John (Ch. iii.).

5th Section.—Jesus renouncing the world, and commencing His conquest of it. While preparing for the public discharge of His office, He has to encounter the threefold temptation of Satan, corresponding to the threefold form in which a worldly minded people had shaped to themselves their hopes of the Messiah. Thus Jesus is constrained to conceal His dignity from the people, and to commence His work in the despised district of Galilee. But God glorifies Him in the homage paid to Him by His disciples and the people (Ch. iv.).

Part Second.

Christ manifests Himself as the true Messiah in His continual conflict with the spurious notions entertained by the Jews concerning the Messiah, and proves Himself the promised Prophet, King, and High Priest.

1st Section.—Christ manifests Himself as the *Prophet:*

- *a.* As Teacher of the kingdom of heaven, in the Sermon on the Mount (Ch. v. to vii.).
- *b.* As Wonder-worker of the kingdom of heaven, attesting and confirming His word (Ch. viii. and ix.).

2d Section.—Christ manifests Himself as the *King:*

- *a.* As Shepherd of His people, in sending to the scattered sheep His twelve Apostles, endowed with the power of His Spirit, for the purpose of establishing the kingdom of heaven (Ch. x.).
- *b.* By bringing out clearly the fact that He has not been owned as Prophet, and by manifesting His royal dignity (Ch. ix.).
- *c.* By proving Himself Lord of the Sabbath, Lord of the people, Conqueror of the kingdom of Satan, the future Judge of His foes, and the Founder of the kingdom of love, or of the family of the saints (Ch. xii.).
- *d.* By presenting in parables the foundation and the development of His kingdom through all its phases, from its commencement to its termination (Ch. xiii. 1–51).

3d Section.—Christ manifests Himself as the *High Priest* in His sufferings;—being rejected,

- *a.* By His own city, Nazareth (Ch. xiii. 52–58).
- *b.* By the political despotism of Herod, the ruler of Galilee (Ch. xiv.).
- *c.* By the Scribes and Pharisees of Jerusalem, or the theological authorities of the schools (Ch. xv.).
- *d.* By the Pharisees and Sadducees, or the theocratical authorities of the whole country (Ch. xvi. 1–12).

Part Third.

Christ presents the future picture of the kingdom of heaven, in opposition to the traditional form of the ancient world and Theocracy.

1st Section.—The Church in its *prophetic* character, as confessing Christ the Son of God, in opposition to the *legal* opinions concerning Him entertained by the synagogue:

a. The Church as confessing Christ (Ch. xvi. 13–20).

b. The Church as bearing the cross of Christ, in contrast to that *worldly* fear of the cross by which He is tempted (Vers. 21–28).

c. The Church as a spiritual communion, in opposition to the solitary tents of spurious separation from the world as exhibited in the history of anchoretism and monasticism (Ch. xvii. 1–8).

d. The Church as wholly unknown and hidden (Vers. 9–13).

e. The Church as wonder-working by the spiritual power of prayer and fasting (Vers. 14–21).

f. The Church in its human weakness (Vers. 22, 23).

g. The Church as free, and yet voluntarily subject, and paying tribute to the old temple (Vers. 24–27).

2d Section.—The *priestly* order in the Church of Christ:

a. The hierarchy of the service of love (Ch. xviii. 1–14).

b. The discipline of the Church (Vers. 15–20).

c. Absolution in the Church (Vers. 21–35).

3d Section.—The *priestly* family in the Church:

a. Marriage in the Church (Ch. xix. 1–12).

b. Children in the Church (Vers. 13–15).

c. Property in the Church (Vers. 16–23).

4th Section.—Future *kingly* manifestation of the Church:

a. Glorious reward of the Apostles, and of all who renounce the world (Vers. 27–30).

b. Reward by free grace (Ch. xx. 1–16).

Part Fourth.

Christ surrendering Himself to the Messianic faith of His people.

1st Section.—Full prophetic anticipation of the end (Ch. xx. 17–19).

2d Section.—Places at the right and the left of His throne, and of His priestly cross (Vers. 20–28).

3d Section.—The courtly pride which would prevent those who are poor and needy from coming to the Lord, and manifestation of Christ as King of mercy (Vers. 29–33).

4th Section.—Prophetic Hosanna of the people, and amazement of Jerusalem (Ch. xxi. 1–11).

5th Section.—Purification of the temple; residence of the King in His temple.

a. The house of prayer and of mercy, in opposition to the den of thieves (Vers. 12–14).

b. The children in the temple, and the high priests and Scribes (Vers. 15, 16).

c. The barren fig tree covered with foliage, but without fruit, on the Temple Mount. Symbolical curse of the priesthood (Vers. 17–22).

6th Section.—Assaults of the outward Theocracy on the King in His temple:

a. Assault of the high priests and elders, and triumph of the Lord (Ch. xxi. 23–xxii. 14).

b. Assault of the Herodians, or of the political party, and triumph of the Lord (Vers. 15–22).

c. Assault of the Sadducees, and triumph of the Lord (Vers. 23–33).

d. Assault of the Pharisees, and triumph of the Lord (Vers. 34–46).

7th Section.—Final judgment of Christ upon the Pharisees and Scribes. Christ of His own accord leaves the temple (Ch. xxiii. to xxiv. 1).

Part Fifth.

Final and fullest manifestation of Christ as the *Prophet;* or, discourses of the Lord concerning the "last things."

1st Section.—The general judgment; or, the end of Jerusalem and that of the world (Ch. xxiv. 2–41).
2d Section.—Judgment on the rulers of the Church (Vers. 42–51).
3d Section.—Judgment upon the Church itself (Ch. xxv. 1–13).
4th Section.—The final judgment as retribution (Vers. 14–30).
5th Section.—The final judgment as separation (Vers. 31–41).

Part Sixth.

Final and fullest manifestation of Jesus as the *High Priest* in His sufferings.

1st Section.—Certitude of the Lord, and incertitude of His enemies (Ch. xxvi. 1–3).
2d Section.—The anointing to the burial; or, the loving woman and the traitor (Vers. 4–16).
3d Section.—The Passover and the Eucharist (Vers. 17–29).
4th Section.—Promises of the disciples and Christ in Gethsemane (Vers. 30–46).
5th Section.—The traitor, the defender, and the disciples generally (Vers. 47–56).
6th Section.—Caiaphas (Vers. 57–68).
7th Section.—Peter (Vers. 69–75).
8th Section.—Judas and the high priests (Ch. xxvii. 1–10).
9th Section.—Pilate, the Jews, and the band of soldiers (Vers. 11–31).
10th Section.—Golgotha (Vers. 32–56).
11th Section.—The burial and the sealing of the tomb (Vers. 57–66).

Part Seventh.

Christ in His full *kingly* glory (Ch. xxviii.).

1st Section.—The angel from heaven (Vers. 1–8).
2d Section.—The Lord, and the women worshipping Him (Vers. 9, 10).
3d Section.—Judaism and its saying; or, impotent end of the old world (Vers. 11–15).
4th Section.—Almighty rule of Christ, and His kingdom in heaven and on earth (Vers. 16–20).

Note.—The view lately broached by Delitzsch (in the Essay: *Neue Untersuchungen über Entstehung der kanonischen Evangelien*, Part I., Leipz., 1853), on the connection between the Gospel of Matthew and the Pentateuch, is exceedingly ingenious, although somewhat strained. Delitzsch sets out by selecting the passage in Matthew v. 17, "I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil," etc., as containing the fundamental idea of the whole Gospel. Thus far we agree with him; but we demur to his inference from this verse, that not only has the Old Testament Theocracy, in all its parts, been fulfilled in the life of the Lord, but that the arrangement of the Gospel is such, that its five parts correspond to, and fulfil, the five portions of the Pentateuch. Our author proceeds to prove this hypothesis by showing how the first chapter of Matthew, or the Book of the Genesis of Christ, corresponds with the Book of Genesis. Similarly as the Book of Exodus opens with the murder of the Hebrew infants in Egypt, so the second chapter of Matthew with that of the infants in Bethlehem. In general, many and striking points of analogy are brought out. The Sermon on the Mount is, of course, the counterpart of the giving of the law. Again, Matt. viii. 1 is a fulfilment of the Book of Leviticus: the cleansing of the leper pointing to the corresponding legal ordinances. Still further, Matt. x. 1 corresponds to the Book of Numbers,—the numbering of the twelve tribes being fulfilled in the selection of the twelve Apostles. Lastly, the portion corresponding to the Book of Deuteronomy commences with ch. xix., when the ministry in Galilee ceases, and that in Judæa begins. In this case Genesis and Leviticus evidently would be too short, Numbers and Deuteronomy too long. The same disproportion would apply to the single parts. The hypothesis is ingenious, but fanciful, and has the disadvantage of overrating a supposed formal correspondence at the expense of the inward and material correspondence. The main thing to be kept in view is the great fact, that the Old Testament Theocracy itself was fulfilled—not in the letter, but in the spirit—by the kingdom of heaven under the New Testament.

THE

GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MATTHEW.

PART FIRST.

Jesus comes into this world, as the Messiah of the true Theocracy, to fulfil the Old Covenant. He remains unknown to and unrecognized by the outward and secular Theocracy of His day. Rejected and cast out by His own, He undertakes secretly His first Messianic pilgrimage into Egypt. But He is glorified and attested by God.

FIRST SECTION.

PROPHETIC TYPES OF THE MESSIAH, IN THE GENEALOGY OF THE MESSIAH.

Chapter I. 1–17 (Luke iii. 23–38).

Contents:—1. Superscription.—2. Fundamental Idea.—3. The Three Divisions of the Genealogy.—4. Number of the Generations.

1 The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham.
2 Abraham begat Isaac;
Isaac begat Jacob;
Jacob begat Judas and his brethren;
3 Judas begat Phares and Zara—
of Thamar;
Phares begat Esrom;
Esrom begat Aram;
4 Aram begat Aminadab;
Aminadab begat Naasson;
Naasson begat Salmon;
5 Salmon begat Booz—
of Rachab;
Booz begat Obed—
of Ruth;
Obed begat Jesse;
6 Jesse begat David the king;
David the king [1] begat Solomon—
of her that had been the wife of Urias;
7 Solomon begat Roboam;
Roboam begat Abia;
Abia begat Asa;
8 Asa begat Josaphat;
Josaphat begat Joram;
Joram begat Ozias;
9 Ozias begat Joatham;
Joatham begat Achaz;
Achaz begat Ezekias;
10 Ezekias begat Manasses;
Manasses begat Amon;
Amon begat Josias;
11 Josias begat Jechonias and his brethren,
about the time they were carried
away (μετοικεσία) to Babylon;
12 And after they were brought to Babylon—
Jechonias begat Salathiel;
Salathiel begat Zorobabel;
13 Zorobabel begat Abiud;
Abiud begat Eliakim;
Eliakim begat Azor;

14 Azor begat Sadoc;
Sadoc begat Achim;
Achim begat Eliud;
15 Eliud begat Eleazar;
Eleazar begat Matthan;
Matthan begat Jacob;
16 Jacob begat Joseph, the husband of
Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who
is called Christ [the Messiah].*
17 So all the generations from Abraham to David, *are* fourteen generations; and from
David, until the carrying away into Babylon, *are* fourteen generations; and from
the carrying away into Babylon unto Christ, *are* fourteen generations.

[1] Ver. 6.—[The title ὁ βασιλεύς, *the king*, is repeated in the *textus receptus* with the majority of MSS. and retained by Meyer, Wordsworth, Lange, but omitted by some of the oldest MSS. and versions, and in the critical editions of Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford (in his *fourth* ed.). The repetition may be defended on the ground of emphasis as giving a clue to the design of this genealogy and showing the kingship of Christ, the heir of the whole theocracy. Dr. Wordsworth makes use of the *textus receptus* as an argument for his view of the relation of the two genealogies: "The genealogy of St. Matthew is Christ's official succession to David as a *king* (see ver. 6, where David is twice called ὁ βασιλεύς). That of St. Luke is the derivation of his origin from David as a *man*,—hence he traces the Lord's pedigree further backward, even to the first *man*, *Adam*, the father of the human race." Dr. W., following the fathers, regards both genealogies as the pedigrees of *Joseph*, not of Mary.—P. S.]

* [The authorized English version of the Greek Testament after the latest standard edition of the American Bible Society (New York, 1862), is made the basis of this Commentary, and all occasional corrections are included in brackets (*see* the Preface). But in this section which contains the genealogy of Christ, I have deviated from the rule and conformed to the new German version of Lange in three points: 1, in the order and arrangement, with the view to bring out more clearly the three divisions or periods of Christ's ancestry; 2, in omitting the oft repeated and unnecessary *and* (for the Greek δέ) between the members of the pedigree; 3, in italicizing the *female* ancestry of Christ, ver. 3, 5, and 6; comp. Comment. p. 49. Italics then do not indicate here additions to the Greek text, as in the Common Version, which, in this genealogy, only supplies the words: "*that had been the wife*," ver. 6. As regards the spelling of proper nouns I have (in the text, not in the notes) adhered to the C. V., although in a *revision* of the English Bible (which is in no way attempted in this Commentary) uniformity in the spelling should undoubtedly be aimed at as much as possible, and Hebrew names should, as a rule, be conformed to the Hebrew, Greek names to the Greek spelling. Thus in this genealogy *Judah* should be substituted for *Judas*, *Pharez* for *Phares*, *Hezron* for *Esrom*, *Ram* for *Aram*, *Nahshon* for *Naasson*, *Boaz* for *Booz*, *Rahab* for *Rachab*, *Uriah* for *Urias*, *Rehoboam* for *Roboam*, *Jehoshaphat* for *Josaphat*, *Uzziah* for *Ozias*, *Jotham* for *Joatham*, *Ahaz* for *Achaz*, *Hezekiah* for *Ezekias*, *Josiah* for *Josias*, *Jeconiah* for *Jechonias*, *Zerubbabel* for *Zorobabel*, *Zadoc* for *Sadoc*. Comp. the Hebrew and Greek dictionaries; Dr. Geo. Campbell's translation of the four Gospels with preliminary dissertations, Lond. 1834, Diss. xii. Pt. iii. 10–14; and Dr. T. J. Conant's "Revised Version of Matthew," New York, 1860, p. 2.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1. The expression βίβλος γενέσεως might be rendered, *book of the nativity*, and hence be applied in a more extended sense to the whole Gospel. But it may also mean *genealogy*, *genealogical table*, *pedigree*; and this is the simplest and most obvious meaning. It is supported, 1) by the analogy of Gen. v. 1 (Sept.); 2) by the reference in ver. 18, τοῦ δὲ Χριστοῦ ἡ γένεσις, and in ii. 1, τοῦ δὲ Ἰησοῦ γεννηθέντος.

Jesus, *Joshua*, יְהוֹשֻׁעַ (Ex. xxiv. 13; Num. xiii. 16), or יֵשׁוּעַ—as the name was written after the Babylonish captivity (Neh. vii. 7)—*God is helper*, or *deliverer*.

Christ, Χριστός, מָשִׁיחַ, *anointed:* the official designation of priests, Lev. iv. 3; v. 16; Ps. cv. 15;—of kings, 1 Sam. xxiv. 7, 11; Ps. ii. 2; Dan. ix. 25, 26. In 1 Kings xix. 16 we also read of anointing to the prophetic office. The inspired teaching of the prophets led Israel to look for salvation in and through a personal Messiah, who, although represented in the first place as the anointed King of the stock of David, was also invested with the attributes of perfect Prophet and of High Priest.

Vers. 2–16. From the expression "Jacob begat Joseph," ver. 16, we gather that we have here the genealogy of *Joseph*, and not that of *Mary*. But why should the Evangelist present this genealogy to his readers? Joseph was descended from David through the legitimate royal line of the house of David; and it was necessary to show that Jesus, the adoptive son of Joseph, was the *legal* heir to the throne of David. But this line of descent was, in the most important respect, also the line of Mary, though she was descended from David through another branch (Luke i. 27; Rom. i. 3). In Joseph's line of descent, the grand characteristics which distinguish the line of Jesus appear in the most striking manner; viz., its spiritual nobility, its humiliations and consecrations in the progress of history, its glorious elevation, and its tragic reverses. It was necessary that even in His line of descent the Lord should be marked out as the chosen sacrificial Lamb of Israel and of the world.

The line of descent, as traced by Matthew, presents various *difficulties*.—First, in the way of omissions. The table gives Rahab as the great-grandmother of David. Yet she lived about 400, or, more precisely, 366 years before David was born. "This difficulty," remarks de Wette, "is connected with the statement in Ruth iv. 20, according to which the line between David and Nahshon is represented as consisting of only four generations." Besides, in the second division of the genealogy, the names of Ahaziah, Joash, and Amaziah are omitted, which, according to 1 Chron. iii. 11, 12, must be inserted between Joram and Ozias; also the name of Jehoiakim, which, according to 2 Kings xxiv. 6; 2 Chron. xxxvi. 8, should come in between Josiah and Jeconiah or Jehoiachin. These omissions were evidently made with the view of reducing the generations from David to the Babylonish captivity to fourteen. But for this Matthew must have had a sufficient reason. According to some critics, the arrangement of the genealogical table was designed merely to aid the memory. Others have imagined that it bore reference to certain cabalistic ideas. W. Hoffmann ex-

plains the discrepancy (*das Leben Jesu*, etc., Stuttgart, 1836) by the supposition that there was some confusion in the genealogical table which Matthew used. According to Ebrard (*Evangelienkritik*, p. 199), the descendants of the heathen Jezebel to the fourth generation were omitted, in strict accordance with the Decalogue. Thus Ahaziah, Joash, and Amaziah were left out. Jehoiakim also was omitted, because, in reference to the Theocracy, he and Jehoiachin really formed but one link in the great chain, and the first was the less worthy of commemoration. But none of the above suggestions supplies a valid reason for the omissions. The true explanation appears to be, that all the individuals omitted by the Evangelist had, in one respect or another, no claim to be regarded as separate and distinct links in the theocratic chain. Ahaziah was a mere puppet in the hand of his mother Athaliah, daughter of Ahaz, king of Israel. Joash deserved the title of sovereign merely so long as he continued under the guidance of Jehoiada the priest, who was the king's son-in-law. After the death of Jehoiada, he yielded entirely to the influence of a godless court. It is remarkable that Jehoiada was buried in the tomb of the kings, but not Joash (2 Chron. xxiv. 16). In accordance with an express prophetic declaration, Amaziah was destroyed on account of his impenitence—according to the Sept.—by God (2 Chron. xxv. 16, 27). Jehoiakim was forcibly made king of Judah by the king of Egypt (2 Chron. xxxvi. 4). Similarly Zedekiah was left out, as having been merely a creature of the king of Babylon, and also because, as brother of Jehoiachin, he formed no new link between Jehoiachin and Salathiel. Assir also is passed over, because no political importance attaches to his life, which was passed in the Babylonish captivity. (Comp. W. Hoffmann, l. c., p. 152; K. Hofmann, *Weissagung und Erfüllung*, ii. 37.)

Further, it will be noticed that the third division contains only thirteen generations, counting Joseph as the twelfth, and adding Jesus as the thirteenth. By this Matthew evidently intended to indicate that the name of Mary was here to be inserted in the genealogy; for in so important a matter he could not have made a mistake. Nor can we admit the supposition that he counted the name of Jechoniah twice,—the second time as anew founding the Messianic line after the Babylonish captivity. At any rate, the Evangelist wished to lay emphasis on the fact, that Joseph was not the natural father of Jesus. Accordingly, there is a sudden break in the natural order of the genealogy: Abraham begat etc., Jacob begat Joseph; and an expression is introduced which forcibly points to the circumstance that Jesus was born of a virgin.

Another point claims our attention. According to Jewish law, a stain attached to each of the four females—Thamar, Rahab, Ruth, and Bathsheba—introduced by Matthew into the genealogy. But we can scarcely infer from this circumstance, with Starke, that they are specially mentioned in order to show that Christ was not ashamed of poor sinners, since He derived from such His human nature, and had received them as His own people; for it is beyond question that Jesus was conceived by Mary without any taint of sin. It was rather the object of the Evangelist to point out to his Jewish readers a higher righteousness than that external and ceremonial sanctity which the Pharisees extolled. No doubt Thamar conceived Phares, knowing that she committed incest; while Judah, although not aware who she was, was guilty of fornication. Still, it was under the impulse of faith, though fanatical and sadly misdirected, that Thamar took that strange and sinful step. She was resolved, at all hazards, to become one of the mothers of God's chosen race. By faith, Thamar rose over the guilt of incest, and Rahab over her former degradation of being a heathen and a harlot. By her heroic faith, Ruth, though pure and unblamable, yet a heathen, attained such distinction, that one of the books in the Old Testament canon bears her name; while Bathsheba, David's accomplice in adultery, became the partner of his penitence and his throne.

In the *arrangement* and *division* of the genealogical tree of Jesus, Matthew was undoubtedly influenced by the Old Testament symbolism of numbers. The grand general arrangement into three groups (patriarchs, kings, and persons of royal extraction) presents an ascending and descending line. In the first fourteen generations there is a gradual ascent (in a secular point of view), culminating in royalty. The second series consists of a line of royal personages, gradually inclining downwards. The third begins during the Babylonish captivity, and forms a descending line, which finally terminates in Joseph the carpenter. Still, the main point in this arrangement is the number three. Three is the grand spiritual number. In spite of the sins and the apostasy of some of the representatives of David, that line always continued specially set apart by God and for God, constituting a hereditary spiritual nobility in the midst of the people of Israel, and of the world at large. In it the hereditary blessing of Abraham was more and more concentrated,—both the blessing of the promise and the blessing of faith. Each of these three groups was again subdivided into a series of fourteen—twice seven. The number seven denotes the full development of nature up to its consecration and transfiguration. Two is the number of contrast—of sex, of life. Accordingly, the number fourteen would indicate that the development of a genealogical line had reached its completion. The number three, on the other hand, denotes the perfect elevation of this perfect natural development of nature into the sphere of spiritual consecration. Hence the forty-two generations point to the spiritual consecration of the theocratic line culminating in Him who was full of the Holy Ghost. On the same principle, the Israelites wandered for forty years (a round number for forty-two) through the wilderness, and had in all forty-two encampments. Thus, in reference both to time and space, the old race had to pass as it were through forty-two stages before a new race (in the symbolical sense) sprang up.

We can here but briefly discuss the *relation* between the genealogy of Jesus according to *Matthew*, and the same as given by *Luke*. So far as their arrangement is concerned, we notice, that while the first genealogy descends from the progenitor, the second ascends from the last scion; and that, while Matthew begins with Abraham, Luke goes beyond the father of the faithful to Adam, the first progenitor of the human race, and to God its Creator. Again, so far as the contents of the two tables are concerned, we find that from David downwards the names are for the most part different, and manifestly constitute two different lines, which coincide only in the names of Zorobabel and Salathiel. Matthew's line passes from David to Solomon, while that of Luke passes from David to his son Nathan. In Matthew's line, the parent of the foster-father of Jesus is called Jacob, while in that of Luke he is designated Eli.

The same discrepancy extends over the whole table,—always assuming that the apparent coincidence of the two lines in Zorobabel and Salathiel is simply due to similarity of names. From the earliest period, various explanations of this difficulty have been suggested. At first it was supposed that, by a marriage according to the law of Levirate (Deut. xxv. 5–10), the two lines had converged in one link. Julius Africanus (according to Eusebius, E. H. I. 7) suggested that Eli died childless, that Jacob espoused his widow, and was the real father of Joseph. But then, according to the law, Eli alone would in that case have been mentioned as the father of Joseph (Deut. xxv. 6). Ambrosius reversed the above hypothesis: Eli, he supposed, was the real, and Jacob the nominal father. But in that case the same difficulty recurs. Other hypotheses are even less plausible. The view most commonly adopted is that of Helvicus (*see* Winer's *Real-Wörterb.* art. *Jesus*), according to which, Luke is supposed to furnish the maternal genealogy; so that the Eli mentioned in Luke iii. 23 was the father of Mary, and, as father-in-law of Joseph, was called his father. The objection of Winer, that in such case Luke would not have employed the terms τοῦ Ἡλί, may be met by a reference to the similar expression τοῦ Θεοῦ, where, of course, it could not be intended to represent God as the natural Father of Adam. The objection, that the Jews were not in the habit of keeping genealogical record of females, does not apply here, as Jesus had no natural father. Besides, down to Eli, the genealogy given is that of males. Lastly, so far as the propriety of the thing was concerned, Luke also inserts the name of Joseph, as being in the eye of the law the father of Jesus. This hypothesis has been adopted by many modern expositors, as Bengel, Heumann, Paulus, Kuinoel, Wieseler, W. Hoffmann (*Leben Jesu*, p. 148).* It was in accordance with the general plan of Luke's Gospel to follow up the genealogical line beyond Abraham to Adam and God, so as to present the Lord both as the Son of man and at the same time the Son of God, and for the same reason, to trace the actual lineage of Jesus, and consequently that of his mother Mary; while Matthew in this respect also represented the theocratic and legal point of view.

Proofs and *parallel passages*:—*Jesus*, Luke i. 31. *Christ*, Lev. iv. 5, 16, etc.; in the New Testament everywhere. *Jesus Christ*, John xx. 31, and in many other places. *Son of David*, Ps. cxxxii. 11; Isa. xi. 1; Acts xiii. 23; Jer. xxiii. 5; Rom. i. 3; Matt. xv. 22, xxi. 9, xxii. 42. *Abraham*, Gen. xii. 3, xxii. 18; 2 Sam. vii. 12; Gal. iii. 16, etc., etc. *Isaac*, Gen. xxi. 2, 3; Rom. ix. 7, 9. *Jacob*, Gen. xxv. 26. *Judah*, Gen. xxix. 35, xlix. 10; Heb. vii. 14. *Pharez* and *Zarah*, Gen. xxxviii. 29, 30. *Hezron* (*Esrom*), 1 Chron. ii. 4, 5. *Aram* or *Ram*, Ruth iv. 19 (Hezron's first-born son omitted, 1 Chron. ii. 9). *Aminadab*, 1 Chron. ii. 10. *Naashon*, Ex. vi. 23. *Salmon*, 1 Chron. ii. 11; Ruth iv. 20. *Rahab*, Josh. ii. 1, vi. 23, 24. *Boaz*, *Obed*, Ruth iv. 13, 17. *Obed*, *Jesse*, Ruth iv. 22; 1 Chron. ii. 12; 1 Sam. xx. 27; 1 Kings xii. 16. *Jesse*, *David*, 1 Chron. ii. 15. *Solomon*, 2 Sam. xii. 24. *Roboam*, *Rehoboam*, 1 Kings xi. 43. *Abia*, *Asa*, 1 Kings xv. 2, 8. *Josaphat*, 2 Chron. xvi. and xvii. *Joram*, 2 Kings viii. 16; 2 Chron. xxi. 1. *Ahaziah*, *Joash*, *Amaziah*, 2 Kings viii. 24; xi. 2, xii. 21; 1 Chron. iii. 11. *Ozias* (or *Azariah*), 2 Kings xiv. 21. *Joatham*, 2 Kings xv. 7; 2 Chron. xxvi. 23. *Ahaz*, 2 Kings xv. 38; 2 Chron. xxvii. 9. *Ezekias* (*Hezekiah*), 2 Kings xvi. 20; 2 Chron. xxviii. 27. *Manasses*, 2 Kings xx. 21. *Amon*, 2 Kings xxi. 18. *Josias*, 2 Kings xxi. 24. *Jechonias*, *Jehoiakim*, 2 Kings xxiii. 35. The Babylonish captivity (2 Kings xxv; 2 Chron. xxxvi.). "ἐπί *notat tempus non stricte tantum sed cum latitudine*," just as Jechonias and his brothers were not born at one and the same time. On three different occasions, within a short period, portions of the people were carried away,—first, during the reign of Jehoiakim, then under that of Jehoiachin, and, lastly, under Zedekiah. But the Evangelist speaks of the three events as of one, because the captivity began under the first of these princes, was extended under the second, and completed under the third.—*Salathiel*, (*Pedaiah*), *Zorobabel*, 1 Chron. iii. 18, 19. *Abiud* (*Hananiah*), 1 Chron. iii. 19. *Abiud*, *Eliakim*, etc., Jewish tradition (Temple registers).

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. Even as original sin has tainted all mankind from the womb, so, and much more, has our race participated in the riches of Divine grace. Hence, in the history of the world, the hereditary curse and the hereditary blessing have always appeared side by side—in Cain and Abel, in Ham and Shem, in the case of the heathen world and of Abraham. Not only has the curse had a blessing for its counterpart, but on each successive occasion the blessing has widened and increased. The blessing of Shem surpassed that of Japheth; the blessing of Judah, that of his brethren; and the blessing of David, that of all Judah and Israel beside. This contrast of blessing and curse led to that between the religion of faith and heathenism. Not that the hereditary blessing of Abraham remained wholly unimpaired by the curse that flowed from Adam's guilt. Hence it was necessary that Christ should die on the cross, though the covenant-blessing centered in Him. Still, this influence of transmitted sin could not destroy either the blessing of personal faith or the hereditary blessing of Abraham; and now that all promises have been fulfilled in Christ, the curse of original sin is, in the case of believers, not only removed, but transformed into blessing.

2. Abraham was told, "In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." It was not said, "In thy oral tradition," or "In thy written records." According to the notions of many, the New Testament should have begun with a list of the books of the Old Testament. Instead of this, however, it begins with a genealogical tree. Through Abraham's

* [For another and a remarkably ingenious explanation of the two genealogies, we refer the reader to Lord Arthur C. Hervey's article, "Genealogy of Jesus Christ," in Smith's Dict. of the Bible, i. p. 666. This is not the place to enter into details of his theory: suffice it to say, that, according to Lord Hervey, *both* the genealogies (in Matthew and Luke) are those of *Joseph*. The genealogy of St. Matthew is "Joseph's genealogy as legal successor to the throne of David; *i. e.*, it exhibits the successive heirs of the kingdom, ending with Christ as Joseph's reputed son. St. Luke's is Joseph's private genealogy, exhibiting his real birth, as David's son, and thus showing why he was heir to Solomon's crown." Lord Hervey further suggests, "that Salathiel, of the house of Nathan, became heir to David's throne on the failure of Solomon's line in Jechonias, and that as such he and his descendants were transferred, as 'sons of Jeconiah,' to the royal genealogical table, according to the principle of the Jewish law, laid down Num. xxvii. 8–11." On the same principle, the other divergences of the two genealogies are explained, till we reach Matthan, who had two sons, Jacob and Heli. The elder of these, Jacob, whose daughter Mary was mother of the Lord, dying without male issue, the succession to the throne of David now devolved on Joseph, the son of Heli.—The Edinb. Translator.]

faith the blessing had descended in his seed as an heirloom. Antipædobaptists overlook this mystery, otherwise they would see more meaning in the admission of infants into the visible Church.

3. Down to David, Joseph's line of descent was the same as that of Mary. It then diverged into two branches. While, however, the royal line terminated in the pious carpenter, Joseph, the line of Nathan, who, though one of David's sons, never ascended the throne, was selected to comprehend the chosen mother of the Lord. In general, the greatest number of the humiliations of the royal house occurred in Joseph's line. In it the godless kings appear in contrast to the pious. Doubtless, it was so ordered that the affliction and obscurity of the house of David should serve to restore its spiritual glory.

4. Even among the ancestors of Jesus, the blessing and the promised salvation was transmitted through the righteousness which is by faith, as distinguished from legal righteousness. This appears not only from the lives of Abraham and David, the fathers of the faithful, and from the pious sovereigns among their descendants, but also from the ancestresses of Jesus, Thamar, Rahab, Ruth, and Bathsheba, specially mentioned by the Evangelist.

5. A sacred pedigree—which may be regarded as symbolizing the real import of noble descent and hereditary nobility, whether Christian or national—conferred not personal holiness on the Jewish monarchs. Spirituality was the attainment of the individual, not the quality of the race, and in every case the combined result of Divine grace and human freedom. Still less could we suppose that the sacredness of the pedigree ultimately manifested itself in the advent of Christ Himself. Christ sprung from the fathers according to the flesh: this was His only connection with them through Mary. According to the Spirit, He was the Son of God, and, as such, the new and perfect manifestation of the Divine Being, the second Adam, the Lord from heaven.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The genealogical table of Jesus, considered as the first New Testament testimony about Him. As a testimony, 1. to His human nature; 2. to His hereditary right; 3. to His Divine character and mission.—The genealogical tree of Jesus a kind of law and gospel for all other genealogical trees, from the lowliest to the highest.—The genealogy of increasing life compared with that of decreasing life, Gen. v.—Christ's human extraction viewed in the light of His Divine origin (John i.): His human descent is based on the Divine, and serves to reveal it.—Contest between the hereditary blessing of Abraham and the hereditary curse of his race.—The hereditary blessing of Abraham in its bearing upon the question of infant baptism.—The family—its import at all times in connection with the kingdom of heaven.—The pious family amidst the storms of the world and of time. 1. It may sink, but not perish.* 2. It endures, because it resists. 3. Its apparent extinction is its glorification.—The sacred birth of Christ and the second birth of man in their agreement and their difference.—Jesus Christ the sum and substance of all religion. 1. Jesus, the man; Christ, His Divine calling and qualification. 2. Jesus, the Hebrew name specially intended for His own people; Christ, the sacred name indicating His designation for the whole world. 3. Jesus, the one Redeemer; Christ, the Mediator of the triune covenant. Or, 1. Jesus as the Christ; 2. the Christ as Jesus.—Jesus Christ the Son of David. 1. The Son of the shepherd of Bethlehem; 2. the Son of the persecuted fugitive in the cave of Adullam; 3. the Son of the warrior and conqueror, the prince of Zion.—Christ the Son of David. 1. In reference to His appearance in the flesh, the last scion of His race, dying on the cross. 2. In reference to His heavenly character, the Prince of the kings of the earth. Or, 1. The end of the Old Testament kingdom; 2. the beginning and the head of the New Testament heavenly kingdom.—Jesus Christ the Son of Abraham. 1. The Finisher of faith; 2. the Fulfiller of the promise.—Jesus the antitype of Abraham in his relation to the world. Abraham, in nascent faith, must go out from the world; Christ, in the fulness of the blessing of faith, enters into it.—Jesus, the Son of Abraham, the seal of God's covenant-truth.—Jesus Christ, as the Son of Abraham, the great witness of God's covenant-faithfulness. 1. In Him was fully revealed the promise which had been given to Abraham. 2. In Him was this promise gloriously fulfilled. 3. In Him it was renewed and glorified.—Christ the Son of Abraham and of David, or the spiritual transfiguration both of the pilgrim's tent and of the throne.—Christ the Son of Abraham and of David, or the Finisher of faith: 1. of faith in the promise; 2. of faith in sovereign grace.—How the advent of Christ was preparing throughout the whole course of antiquity: 1. By means of the house of David; 2. by means of the race of Abraham; 3. by the whole course of events in the world.—The root out of a dry ground.—Known to, and fixed by, the Lord is every hour and event in His kingdom.—The vicissitude of glory and obscurity in the history of the kingdom of God. Christ appeared, not in the days of Israel's power and glory, but in the days of their humiliation.—The share which the royal line of Solomon had in giving birth to Christ. 1. How infinitely it receded behind the lineage of Mary; 2. yet how at the same time it symbolizes the protection extended by the State to the Church.—The Lord's humiliation and exaltation prefigured in His genealogical tree.—In His ancestors Jesus has lived through the whole extent of the world's previous history.—The history of the ancestors of Jesus shows that the life of each successive individual was preserved as by a miracle.—Jesus the sacred heir of the ancient world. 1. As heir of the blessing, He is the Prophet of the world. 2. As heir of the sufferings entailed by the curse, He is its atoning High Priest. 3. As heir of the promise, He is its King.—Jesus Christ the end of the world, and the beginning of the world.—Jesus Christ the closing of the old, and the commencement of the new dispensation.—Abraham and Mary as the beginning and the end of the old covenant.—Jesus, the Son of Mary: 1. the affinity; 2. the contrast.

Braune:—Jesus Christ, the second Adam.—God's grace is constantly renewed through the line of generations.—All sorts of men, kings, heroes, shepherds, mechanics, heathens, sinners, prophets, poets, sages are among the ancestors of Christ, and become poorer and obscurer as they approach Christ.

* [German: "Es kann *sinken*, aber nicht *versinken*;" it may *go down*, but not *go out*. Mr. Edersheim translates: "It may sink, but not utterly." The word-play in the next sentence: "Es *besteht*, weil es *widersteht*," might be rendered: "It *stands* because it *withstands*," comp. Eph. vi. 13.—P. S.]

SECOND SECTION.

JESUS, AS MIRACULOUSLY CONCEIVED BY HIS MOTHER IN FAITH, OR IN THE MYSTERY OF HIS INCARNATION, IS NOT RECOGNIZED EVEN BY THE LEGITIMATE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE HOUSE OF DAVID (JOSEPH), TILL ATTESTED BY AN ANGEL FROM HEAVEN.

CHAPTER I. 18–25 (Luke i. 26–33).

CONTENTS:—The tragical situation of the two betrothed descendants of David at their first appearance in history. Mary, pregnant by the power of the Holy Ghost, misunderstood and doubted by her betrothed. Joseph's intention of privately putting her away. The mother and child vindicated from dishonor by Divine intervention. Joseph's faith. Ancient prophecy. The name: *Jesus*.

18 Now the birth of Jesus Christ was on this wise: When[1] as His mother Mary was
espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy
19 Ghost. Then Joseph her husband, being a just *man*, and not willing to make her a
20 public example, was minded to put her away [by divorce] privily. But while he thought
on these things, behold, the [an] angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a dream, saying,
Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife: for that which is
21 conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost. And she shall bring forth a son, and thou
22 shalt call His name JESUS: for He shall save His people from their sins. Now all
this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet,
23 saying, Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall
24 call His name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us (Isa. vii.). Then
Joseph being raised from sleep did as the angel of the Lord had bidden him, and took
25 unto him his wife: And knew her not till she had brought forth her firstborn[2] son: and
he called His name JESUS.

[1] Ver. 18.—Lit.: "*For* when," μνηστευθείσης γάρ.

[2] Ver. 25.—[πρωτότοκον, in ver. 25, is omitted in Codd. Sin. and Vat., in the old Egyptian versions, Hilar., Ambros., Greg., Hieron., and in the critical editions of Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Alford. Lange in his version retains it, and Meyer defends it. It may have been inserted from Luke ii. 7; but the omission may also be easily explained from superstitious veneration of the Blessed Virgin, as necessarily implying her perpetual virginity, which the term "*first-born*" seemed to disprove.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 18. The Evangelist commences his narrative at the period when Mary's pregnancy had become matter of certainty, about the time of her return from visiting Elisabeth.

The reading γένεσις is much better established in ver. 18 than γέννησις, and clearly more appropriate, as the event in question was not properly a γέννησις [begetting].

Of the Holy Ghost.—The notion of begetting is completely excluded by that of the Holy Ghost. The secret influence of the Spirit is more minutely described in Luke i. 35.

Ver. 19. **Joseph being a just man** (lit. *being just*).—The word *just* has been falsely interpreted as kind, tender-hearted. To have acted upon his suspicion in reference to Mary as if it had been matter of certainty, would have been not merely unkind, but unjust. Such conduct would have been all the more inexcusable, since Mary had informed him not only of the fact of her pregnancy, but likewise of its cause. Joseph was unable to share her faith; but neither could he bring his mind entirely to disbelieve her account. This struggle of doubt and of suspicion with his feelings of generosity and of previous high esteem for Mary, influenced the decision at which he arrived. He resolved not to accuse her publicly (the reading παραδειγματίσαι is an explanation of δειγματίσαι); that is, not to dismiss her by a bill of divorce, which would have stigmatized her as an adulteress, but to dismiss her privately by a bill of divorce without assigning any reason for it. Thus her disgrace would at least not become matter of notoriety, although, of course, suspicion would attach to her; at any rate, her child might still be regarded as the son of Joseph. By this conduct he would unquestionably have taken upon himself a portion of her ignominy. He might be considered a hard-hearted man, who turned away a noble woman unjustly. These circumstances afford an insight into the inward struggle which both experienced. On the bill of divorce, comp. Deut. xxiv. 1–3; Matt. xix. 8.

Ver. 20. **The Angel of the Lord** that appeared to him in a vision when sleeping, was the angel of the Lord in the peculiar and historical sense of that term—*the Angel of the Lord*, Gen. xvi. 7, 9, and in other passages; or *the Angel of the presence*, Ex. xxxii. 34; xxxiii. 14; Isa. lxiii. 9; or *the Angel of the covenant*, Mal. iii. 1. The angel *Gabriel* (*hero of God*), who, according to Luke i., delivered the messages relating to the birth of Christ, was probably only a more definite manifestation of the *Angel of the Lord* (Dan. viii. 16; ix. 21). The angel of Christ's incarnation must, in this case, be carefully distinguished from later angelic apparitions. (*See* the author's *Leben Jesu*, ii. B. 1, 41.)

In a dream.—It is worthy of remark that the Joseph of the New Testament, like the Joseph of the Old Testament, uniformly received his revelations in dreams. This particular form of revelation may have been chosen, 1. because his spiritual life was imperfectly developed; 2. because of his spiritual sincerity and simplicity of heart.

Mary thy wife.—Among the Jews the betrothed bore the title of *wife*.

Of the Holy Ghost.—Both the descent of Jesus and His mission were revealed long before His actual appearance on earth. His birth, His name, and His work were equally from the Holy Ghost.

Vers. 22 and 23. On the Messianic application of Isa. vii. 14, consult the commentaries. It must, however, be observed that the Evangelist Matthew uses the expression, "*was fulfilled*," ἐπληρώθη, in reference not merely to the fulfilling of conscious verbal predictions, but also to that of typical prophecies. In the passage before us the reference is probably to a typical prophecy. The virgin (עַלְמָה) presented to Ahaz as a sign, was a type of the holy Virgin for the following reasons: 1) her future pregnancy and her giving birth to a son were announced even before her marriage had actually taken place; 2) the highest and strongest kind of faith was called into exercise in connection with this child, by which it obtained the name of Immanuel, and became the sign of approaching deliverance in a season of peculiar trial; 3) the name *Immanuel* was verified in the God-Man; 4) all these circumstances served to render the birth of this child peculiarly sacred, and to connect it with the future of Israel; thus strikingly prefiguring the advent of the holy child, the Hope of Israel.

Vers. 24 and 25. Joseph believed in consequence of the Divine intimation he had received in a dream, and forthwith married Mary, with all the Jewish marriage ceremonies, from a regard to her reputation. But he did not consummate the marriage till Mary had given birth to her first-born. From the expression, **first-born**, v. 25, it must not, however, be inferred that Mary subsequently bore other children. An only child was also designated first-born. The term merely implied that this was the child which had opened the womb (Gen. xxvii. 19, 32; Ex. xiii. 2). That Jesus had no actual brother according to the flesh, will appear on closer consideration of the real extraction of the so-called brothers of the Lord. They were the sons of Alphæus, Joseph's brother, and of Mary, the wife of Alphæus, the sister-in-law (not the sister) of the mother of the Lord. (*See* the author's dissertation in his "*History of the Apost. Age*," i. p. 189; and his article, *Jacobus, der Bruder des Herrn*, in Herzog's "*Real-Encycl.*") * The expression, "brethren (brothers) of the Lord," has been taken in its literal sense by the Antidicomarianites in the ancient Church, and by many modern Protestant theologians; while the Roman Catholic Church, since the times of the Collyridians, of Epiphanius, Ambrose, etc., has gone to the opposite extreme of maintaining that Joseph and Mary never lived together on terms of husband and wife. (Meyer, in his Commentary, hastily ascribes the same view to Olshausen, Lange, von Berlepsch. Our text indicates the opposite.) †

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. If it may be said of Abraham, that his faith brought [Germ.: *hineingeglaubt*] the word of the Lord as a word of promise into the world, it may, in the same way, be said of Mary, that her faith brought the incarnation of the Word into the world. And as the faith of Abraham was the connecting link by which the Divine blessing attached itself to his seed according to the promise, so Mary, by her strong and living faith, conceived, through the Holy Ghost, the Lord, the Saviour of the world. The faith of Abraham established a connection between physical birth and spiritual regeneration; but, in the inspired faith of Mary, birth and regeneration have become actually one,—nay, the birth of Christ was regeneration not merely in a passive, but also in an active sense. It was creative regeneration—sinlessness, which became the efficient cause of the regeneration of men; sinlessness redeeming from sin. Those who hold that Christ derived from Mary our sinful nature, which became transformed into sinlessness by His unswerving holiness till death, argue as if regeneration were the goal of Christianity, whereas it is its commencement. In this respect they, as well as the Baptists, come very far short of Abraham's faith. Abraham had not merely, like Melchisedec, faith as an individual, but also as the head of a family; and this faith comprehended his house and his posterity. He believed in the sanctification of nature, in the consecration of birth, and in the spiritual exaltation of natural descent by reception into the household of God. In Mary, the divine inspiration of faith went along with her conception as virgin-mother; and hence, in her Son, the eternal Logos was united to human nature. (For a discussion on the miraculous birth, *see* Lange's *Leben Jesu*, vol. ii. p. 66.)

2. The unutterably tragical situation of the Virgin, misunderstood and deserted by her betrothed, presents a striking type of the future history of her Son, when denied and abandoned by men, even his disciples. Similarly, however, her vindication by the angel of the Lord prefigures Christ's glorification. Mary forsaken by her husband was a type of Christ's loneliness in Gethsemane and on the cross.

3. The expression, "an angel of the Lord," is subsequently explained by the introduction of the definite article—*the* angel of the Lord—connecting it with the whole Christology of the Old Testament.

4. In the same way, the announcement of the angel of the Lord is connected with the Bible doctrine of the Trinity; and that of the name *Jesus* with the doctrine of redemption.

5. The relation between dreams and other forms of divine revelation, is to be gathered from the doctrine of visions, and of their different forms.

6. In the passage which refers to the fulfilment of the prediction, contained in Isa. vii. 14, we must properly appreciate the spirit of Old Testament prophecy generally, the New Testament explanation of its various statements, and, lastly, the difference between typical and verbal prophecy.

* [Compare also, on the other hand, the article *Jacobus* in Winer's *Real-Wörterbuch*, i. p. 525 sqq., and P. Schaff: "*Das Verhältniss des Jacobus Alphæi zu Jacobus dem Bruder des Herrn*," Berlin, 1841.—Tրsl.]

† [In this sentence, which is omitted in the Edinb. transl., Lange means to deny the perpetual virginity of Mary, as held by the Roman Church, and attributed to him by Meyer. Lange admits the reality of the marriage of Joseph and Mary and their cohabitation *after* the birth of Jesus, but, like Olshausen, he considers it incompatible with the dignity of Mary as the mother of the Saviour of the world, to have given birth to ordinary children of man. He also holds that Christ must be the last in the royal line of David and could have no successor or rival. But this reasoning is dogmatic, not exegetical. On the force of the ἕως οὗ in this connection, compare Meyer's and Add. Alexander's remarks on Matt. i. 25.—P. S.]

7. In examining the passage, "and he knew her not," etc., we must make a vast difference between the question whether Joseph and Mary lived together on terms of conjugal intercourse, and the inquiry whether Mary had afterwards other sons.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The trials of Jesus' mother when disowned and forsaken, prefigured His own trials when denied and deserted: 1. In both cases the cause was the same—faith. 2. The import was the same—elevation above the world. 3. The issue was the same—glory. 4. Lastly, the effect was the same—the awakening of faith.—The mother and the Son. 1. The great similarity between them. 2. The infinite difference.—The share female character has had in promoting the kingdom of God, 1. in its extension; 2. in its limitation.—Mary a model of unshaken confidence in God.—Committing oneself to the Lord leads to success even in the world.—On the connection between mistrust and unbelief.—How the entertaining of generous sentiments may become the means of preserving our faith.—An honest doubter will obtain light.—The first New Testament narrative commends to us a holy consideration for woman.—High regard for the honor and reputation of woman.—Justice must ever be allied to gentleness.—The infinite blessing which rewarded Joseph's self-denial.—The manifestation of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, concentrated in the birth of Christ.—The Holy Spirit introduced the Son into the world; and the Son, the Holy Spirit.—Symbolical lessons of the creative action of the Holy Spirit in the birth of Christ. 1. It points back to the creation of the world (Gen. i. 2), and to the creation of man. (The breath of God, Gen. ii. 7.) 2. It points forward to the creation of the Church, and the founding of the heavenly city of God (Acts ii.).—The miraculous birth of Christ viewed in the light of the miraculous birth of Adam.—The miraculous birth of Jesus as the regeneration of man.—Import of the name Jesus (the Redeemer) in connection with salvation: 1. A seal and assurance of the mode of redemption. 2. A proclamation of the fact of redemption. 3. A celebration of His work of redemption.—Joshua a type of Jesus: 1. As the hero of the achievements of faith, who followed upon Moses the lawgiver; 2. as champion in the strength of the Lord; 3. as the leader of the people from the desert to Canaan.—Redemption from sin and deliverance from sin are inseparable.—"The people" of Jesus, and they alone, are the saved. 1. We must belong to His people (listen to awakening grace) in order to obtain salvation. 2. We must be in a state of salvation (surrender ourselves to converting grace) in order wholly to belong to His people.—The people of Jesus a wonderful people of the "wonderful" King. 1. They are one in Christ, and yet diffused among all nations. 2. This people existed before it appeared (the elect), and appeared before it existed (the typical people of God under the Old Covenant). 3. They suffer with Christ, until, to appearance, they perish, and yet triumph with Christ throughout all eternity.

Jesus as Immanuel.—Jesus as the first-born in every respect (Col. ii. 15–18).—*Gossner*:—*True love* finds a way between jealousy and insensibility.—God forsakes none who confide in him.—*Braune*:—Divine interposition saves.—(Gal. iv. 5.)

THIRD SECTION.

ON HIS APPEARANCE UPON EARTH, HE IS REJECTED, DESPISED, AND PERSECUTED BY THE THEOCRATIC CITY, THE THEOCRATIC PROPHETS, THE THEOCRATIC PRIESTHOOD, AND ROYALTY; BUT OWNED AND GLORIFIED BY GOD, IN SIGNS FROM HEAVEN, IN THE ADORATION OF WISE MEN FROM THE HEATHEN WORLD, AND IN HIS MIRACULOUS AND DIVINE PRESERVATION, EFFECTED BY THE FLIGHT INTO EGYPT, AND BY HIS CONCEALMENT DURING HIS YOUTH IN THE OBSCURITY OF GALILEE.

Chapter II. (Luke ii.)

Contents:—Immediately on His appearance commenced the grand conflict between the Christ of the true theocracy and the degenerate, worldly form of the theocracy as then subsisting. *Judaism rejects Him; the heathen world receives Him* (the East and Egypt). Jerusalem knows nothing of Him, and is thrown into alarm at the tidings of His appearance. The high priests and the scribes are, by their knowledge of the Scriptures, able to indicate correctly the place of His birth, but they treat the announcement of His birth as if it were an idle report. Herod attempts to slay the child, first by craft, and then by a general massacre. The escape into Egypt is signalized by the martyrdom of the children at Bethlehem; and Jesus is only preserved for the work given Him by the Father by His concealment in heathen Egypt, and afterwards in semi-pagan Galilee. On the other hand, Joseph and Mary, a poor couple, and the heathen magi, are His guardians and witnesses; while the children and mothers of Bethlehem are involuntary sharers in His sufferings. But, despite the contempt poured on Him by a carnal and degenerate theocracy, God in various ways glorifies Him as the true heir of the theocracy; so that the events recorded in this section really corroborate the fact of His Divine mission. Every circumstance bears testimony in His favor: 1) His birth in Bethlehem, or the Divine word of promise, the Scripture. 2) The miraculous star in the sky, or Nature. 3) Heathen philosophy in its noblest aspirations (although clouded by error), under the guidance of Providence, or the course of history. 4) The unsuspecting sleep, and the fearful awakening of sinners at His name. 5) Orthodox unbelief, which, even in its stagnation, is

compelled to point to Bethlehem. 6) The belief of the wise men bursting through the mist of astrological delusion. 7) The triumph of Christian simplicity over the craft of the world, through the guidance of the Divine Spirit. 8) The martyrdom at Bethlehem. 9) The devoted resignation of the Holy Family, the relatives of the Lord. 10) The miraculous deliverance and preservation of the Lord in the same heathen country from which Israel had been brought. 11) Jesus growing up in obscurity and lowliness at Nazareth. 12) His providential preservation, accomplished by means apparently the slightest, viz., prophetic dreams.

A. CHAPTER II. 1–12.

The Gospel for Epiphany. (More recently designated the Missionary perikope.)

1 Now when Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judea in the days of Herod the king,
2 behold, there came wise men [magi] from the east to Jerusalem, Saying, Where is he that
is born King of the Jews? for we have seen his star in the east [or, when first it rose],
3 and are come to worship him. When Herod the king had heard *these things*, he was
4 troubled, and all Jerusalem with him. And when he had gathered all the chief priests
and scribes of the people together, he demanded of them where Christ should be born.
5 And they said unto him, In Bethlehem of Judea: for thus it is written by the prophet,
6 And thou Bethlehem, *in* the land of Juda, art not the least among the princes of Juda:
7 for out of thee shall come a Governor, that shall rule my people Israel. Then Herod,
when he had privily called the wise men, inquired of them diligently what time the
8 star appeared. And he sent them to Bethlehem, and said, Go and search diligently for
the young child; and when ye have found *him*, bring me word again, that I may
9 come and worship him also. When they had heard the king, they departed; and, lo,
the star, which they saw in the east, went before them, till it came and stood over
10 where the young child was. When they saw the star, they rejoiced with exceeding
11 great joy. And when they were come into the house, they saw[1] the young child with
Mary his mother, and fell down and worshipped him: and when they had opened
their treasures, they presented unto him gifts; gold, and frankincense, and myrrh.
12 And being warned of God in a dream that they should not return to Herod, they departed into their own country another way.

[1] Ver. 11. [*They saw*, εἶδον, *text. rec.*, is followed by Lange in his Germ. vers. It is sufficiently supported by authorities, while εὗρον, *they found*, may have arisen, as Meyer suggests, from the εὕρητε in ver. 8.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

On the genuineness of this chapter, as well as of the former, comp. Meyer's Commentary on Matth., p. 59.*

Ver. 1. **Bethlehem** (בֵּית לֶחֶם, *house of bread*), Βηθλεὲμ τῆς Ἰουδαίας, *Bethlehem of Judea*, as distinguished from Bethlehem in the tribe of Zebulon, Josh. xix. 15. "Bethlehem Ephratah (Gen. xxxv. 16, 19) was situated in the tribe of Judah (comp. Judg. xvii. 9; xix. 1; 1 Sam. xvii. 12), six Roman miles, or two hours' walk, to the south of Jerusalem." (Reland, *Palæstina*, p. 642 foll.; Rosenmüller, *Handbuch der biblischen Alterthumskunde*, ii. 1, p. 123; Robinson, *Pal.* i. p. 470; Tobler, *Bethlehem* in Palæstina, St. Gall, 1848. With these comp. the recent travels of Schubert, Strauss, Schulz, etc.) The earlier name of Bethlehem was *Ephratah*, which probably also included its environs. This small town was the ancestral seat of the house of David (Ruth i. 1, 2). It was fortified by Rehoboam (2 Chron. xi. 16), but remained an insignificant place (Mic. v. 1), and is not even mentioned among the towns of Judah either in the Hebrew text of Joshua or in Neh. xi. 25. The striking contrast between its insignificance and its future destiny is brought out by the prophet Micah, in a prophecy which forms one of the most pointed Messianic predictions (*see* ver. 6). At present, Bethlehem is a small but populous town in a well-cultivated district. As to the road from Bethlehem to Jerusalem, *see* von Raumer's *Palestina*, p. 276. "Bethlehem itself is situated on a ridge of moderate size, extending from east to west. It consists of about 100 indifferent dwellings, partly cut out in the rock, and contains 600 inhabitants capable of bearing arms, partly Turks and partly Christians. As the town in the year 1834 took part in the insurrection against Ibrahim Pasha, he caused the Turkish quarter to be destroyed. Since that time the place is inhabited exclusively by Christians, 3,000 in number." Comp. Robinson, I. 470–'73 (Am. ed.).*

* [Meyer properly defends the genuineness of the first two chapters, as Fritzsche, Kuinöl, Griesbach and others did before him, chiefly for the following reasons: 1) They are found in all Greek manuscripts and ancient versions; also the fathers of the second and third centuries quote several passages from them. Even the hostile Celsus refers to them (Origenes, *Contra Cels.* i. 38; ii. 32). 2) Their contents are especially adapted to the object of a Gospel for Jewish Christians. 3) The beginning of ch. iii. is closely connected with ii. 23, and also iv. 13 refers to ii. 23. 4) Construction and phraseology correspond with that of the whole Gospel.—The chief argument of the opponents is the omission of these two chapters in the Hebrew Gospel of the Ebionites (Epiph. *Haer.* xxx. 13); but this may be easily explained from the heretical character of this sect and their denial of the divinity and the miraculous conception of Christ.—P. S.]

* [Rev. Benj. Bausmann, who visited Bethlehem in 1857, thus describes it, in his work *Sinai and Zion*, Philad. 1861, p. 325: "Bethlehem and Calvary—joy and sorrow, life and death—are never far apart in this world. The town is built on the crest of a small hill, surrounded by other hills. The whole is surrounded by a wall about thirty feet high, with a number of gates through which you enter in. . . . Its present population is about 4,000, all belonging to the Greek Church. . . . The inhabitants now have the name of being a lawless, quarrelsome people, who are in the habit of

In the days of Herod the king.—The monarch here alluded to was Herod surnamed *the Great.* He was the first sovereign of the Idumæan (or Edomite) race, which, from the year 40 before Christ, reigned over Judæa, under the supremacy of Rome (Joseph. *Antiq.* xiv. 1, 3; *de Bello Jud.* 1, 8, 9). Herod the Great was a son of Antipater, whom Cæsar had appointed procurator of Judæa at the time he acknowledged Hyrcanus II., the Maccabæan prince, as king. When a youth of fifteen, Herod was entrusted by his father with the government of the province of Galilee (Joseph. *Antiq.* xiv. 9, 2). Subsequently, as "strategos" of Cœlesyria, he defeated the Maccabæan prince Antigonus (son of Aristobulus), who had made an attempt to recover the sovereignty of which Aristobulus had been deprived. The Roman triumvir Antony made Herod and his brother Phasael tetrarchs. Driven from his province by Antigonus, Herod repaired to Rome, where, through the favor of Antony, he was declared by the Roman Senate king of Judæa. But he was obliged to call in the help of Rome before he could make himself master of his new capital, Jerusalem. After the fall of Antony, he succeeded in securing the favor of Augustus. For his further history, comp. the article *Herod* in Winer's and other *Bibl. Encycl.*, and Josephus.—Herod was destined to sustain a most ominous part in Jewish history. At his accession, he founded the Idumæan dynasty on the ruins of the Asmonæan or Maccabæan race. (Comp. the genealogical tables of the Asmonæan house and of the Herodian, in von Raumer's *Palestina*, p. 331.) The glorious race of the Maccabees had fallen through their fanatical presumption, and a servile deference to the ultra-legalist religious party,—just as a similar ultra-ecclesiastical policy led to the ruin of various Byzantine dynasties, and in more modern times to that of the Stuarts in Great Britain, and of the Bourbons in France. The Idumæan dynasty, on the other hand, pursued a crafty secular policy, by which it succeeded in maintaining itself for a considerable time, under the most difficult circumstances. This policy consisted in flattering the party of the Pharisees, by the building of the temple, and by other tokens of religious zeal; while at the same time the favor of Rome was courted by servility, by concessions to heathenism, and by the introduction of Grecian customs. It is noteworthy that the same Herod who had already extinguished the priestly and royal house of the Maccabees by the murder of its last heirs, also attempted to destroy the true and eternal royalty of the house of David. But, strictly speaking, it was not with Herod that the outward sceptre first passed from the tribe of Judah to an alien family, as even the Maccabæan dynasty belonged to a different tribe, that of Levi. Hence, when the royal power was conferred on the Maccabees in the person of Simon, it was *with an express reservation of the rights of the Messiah* (1 Macc. xiv. 41). On the other hand, the Idumæans had, for more than a hundred years before that, been Jews,—the Maccabee Hyrcanus having compelled them to submit to circumcision. The Herodian dynasty remained, however, Idumæan in spirit,—circumcised semi-pagan and barbarian, though outwardly civilized. According to the statements of the Fathers (quoted by Winer, i. p. 481, note 5), the Herodians were of purely heathen extraction,—their ancestors having been Philistines from Ascalon, who had been brought to Idumæa as prisoners of war. But while the Asmonæans enjoyed the royal dignity with the express acknowledgment that the sceptre belonged to the "coming Prophet," Herod recognized no such expected Messiah; or rather entertained only superstitious fears about Him, and cherished the desire of effecting His destruction. In this respect Herod may be said to have removed the sceptre from Judah, although not in the primary sense of the prediction in Gen. xlix. 10 (*see* the author's *Positive Dogmatik*, p. 668).

Herod died in the fourth year before the commencement of our era, shortly before Easter (Joseph. *Antiq.* xvii. 9, 3). Accordingly, the birth of Christ must have taken place at least four years earlier than the usual date. *See* Wieseler, *Chronol. Synopse*, p. 50; and the author's *Leben Jesu*, ii. p. 106.

Wise men, lit. *Magi*, μάγοι, מְגִים.—The name originally belonged to a high sacerdotal caste among the Persians and Medes, who formed the king's privy council, and cultivated astrology, medicine, and occult natural science. They are frequently mentioned by ancient authors, such as Herodotus (i. 132), Diogenes Laertius (i. 1, 9), Ælian, Porphyry, Cicero, and Pliny. During the time of the Chaldæan dynasty, there also existed an order of magi at the court of Babylon (Jer. xxxix. 3), of which Daniel was made the president (Dan. ii. 48). Subsequently the name was transferred to those Eastern philosophers in general who studied astrology, the interpretation of dreams, occult natural science, and the like. (*See* Winer's *Real-Wörterbuch.*) At the time of Christ, many natives of Syria and Arabia, as well as Greeks and Romans, professed to be adepts in the magical art, and employed it for gain or personal advancement, taking advantage of the curiosity and superstition of their contemporaries. The names of Simon Magus, who drew down the rebuke of Peter, and of Elymas the sorcerer, who opposed Paul, will at once occur to the reader as familiar instances. The magi mentioned in the text belonged to the earlier class of Eastern sages, whose researches were sincere and earnest.

They are called **wise men from the East,** μάγοι ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν. The expression, ἀπὸ ἀνατ., may be joined with equal propriety to the noun preceding or to the verb following. The first construction, however, is preferable, giving to the expression, *magi*, its full import; but the particular part of the East from which they came, cannot be determined. Justin, Tertullian, and many others (see Meyer), fixed on *Arabia;* Chrysostom, Theophylact, and others on *Persia;* while some have specified *Parthia*, *Babylonia*, and even *Egypt* and *Ethiopia*. At all events, they were of Eastern origin; and the Evangelist seems to imply that they came from Persia or Mesopotamia, the seat of the original magi. In attempting to account for the manner in which they had become acquainted with the Jewish expectation of a Messiah, some have laid too much stress on uncertain historical statements; while, more recently, others have entirely disregarded the established historical

rebelling against the Government. Some of them live by farming small patches of the rocky country around the town, and from the fruit of the fig, pomegranate, olive. and vine, which cover some of the neighboring hills; others live by carving events in the history of our Saviour on sea shells, and other curious trinkets, which they sell to the pilgrims that visit Jerusalem during the Easter season. . . . Its general appearance is like that of other towns in the East,—narrow, crooked streets, flat-roofed houses, mostly small, with fronts all walled up, save a small floor-door. It has no hotel or place of entertainment; the travellers usually lodge in the convent," etc.—P. S.]

fact, that some such expectation was generally entertained at the time. Thus Suetonius mentions, in his Life of Vespasian (iv.), that throughout the East there was a general and settled belief, that about this period one would come from Judæa who should subdue the world. Tacitus (*Hist.* v. 13) refers to a similar expectation. But probably these two historians derived their statements only from a passage in Josephus (*De Bello Judaico*, vi. 5, 4. *See* Gieseler, *Kirchengeschichte*, vol. i. p. 47). Josephus, in his usual cringing manner, perverted the Scripture promise of a Messiah, applying it to Vespasian, who, from his campaign in Judæa or from the East, had gone to take possession of the empire of the world (*see* my *Leben Jesu*, vol. ii. p. 105). But, on the other hand, it is undeniable that the temple of Jerusalem was famed all over the East (*see* Gieseler, vol. i. p. 46); that at that time the Jews had already spread over the known world; and that they had gained converts among the most intellectual and earnest inquirers of all countries. Such, for example, were the Greeks mentioned by John (xii. 20). Nor must we forget that the greatest part of the ten tribes of Israel had remained in Parthia, though their ideas and hopes concerning the Messiah were probably not so clear and well defined as those of their brethren in Palestine. (See *The Nestorians*, or *The Ten Tribes*, by Asahel Grant, 1843.) From the circumstance that three different kinds of gifts were offered, the strange inference has been drawn, that *three* "wise men" presented them. Similarly, a purely fanciful interpretation of Ps. lxxii. 10; Isa. xlix. 7; lx. 3, 10, led to the idea, especially since the fifth century, that the magi were *kings*. Even before that time, this view had been propounded by Tertullian (*Adv. Marc.* iii. 13). Chrysostom speaks of twelve magi, and Epiphanius increased their number to fifteen.

The mediæval Church blended the commemoration of the holy three kings (*Gaspar*, *Melchior*, and *Balthasar*, as they were called, although other names are also assigned them), with the festival of the Epiphany (6th Jan.). This feast, which was first instituted in the Eastern Church, commenced there the annual cycle of Christian festivals, and primarily bore reference to the baptism of Christ. As the Eastern Church adopted Christmas from the West, so the Western received the Epiphany from the East, by an interchange similar to that in regard to the use of organs and bells. The first trace of its celebration in the West occurs during the latter half of the fourth century (when, according to Ammianus Marcellinus, it was observed by the Emperor Julian at Vienne in 360). So early as the time of Augustine, it was celebrated in the West as Christ's first manifestation to the Gentiles, the precedent and warrant for it being derived from the adoration of the magi in the passage under consideration. Hence also its name—*Festival of the three Kings*. In process of time, three different events came to be connected with this festival: 1) The baptism of Christ; 2) Christ's first manifestation to the Gentiles; 3) the first miracle at Cana, John ii. 11. A fourth reference to the miraculous feeding of the 5000 persons was afterward added. Comp. the article *Epiphanienfest* in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopædie*; also in Aschbach's *Allgem. Kirchenlexicon*, and in Strauss's *Kirchenjahr*. The legends on this subject gave rise, as is well known, to a strange medley of ecclesiastical and popular usages.

We have no authentic record of the number and the social position of these magi. There must, of course, have been more than one; and they must have been persons of wealth and rank, who, in all probability, would travel with a considerable retinue, so that their arrival at Jerusalem must have produced a sensation. That they were Gentiles and not Jews, appears from the whole tenor of the narrative; from the pointed contrast to which the Evangelist manifestly intends to draw attention; and especially from the question: "Where is the newborn King of the Jews?" Accordingly, most commentators are agreed on this question. (*See* Meyer, p. 68.)

Ver. 2. **We have seen His star.**—This cannot refer either to a comet (Origen and others), or a meteor, still less to an angelic apparition (Theophylact). Among the ancients, a comet was rarely considered a good omen; a meteor would blaze and burst; while an angelic vision would disappear when its object was accomplished. We have no knowledge that an entirely new star made its appearance at that time, and again disappeared. Astrologers drew their inferences not so much from an individual star, as from a constellation of stars, although the import of the vision was gathered from the presence or position of one particular star in the constellation. (*See* Lange's *Leben Jesu*, vol. ii. p. 105.) "The famous astronomer Kepler (*De Jesu Christi vero anno natalitio*, Francf. 1606; comp. Münter, *Stern der Weisen*, Kopenhagen, 1827) has shown, that in the year 747 from the building of Rome, a very remarkable threefold conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn in the sign *Pisces* occurred; and that in the spring of the following year the planet Mars likewise appeared in this constellation. He regarded it as probable that an extraordinary star was conjoined with these three planets, as was the case in the year 1603. Kepler was of opinion that this conjunction formed the star of the magi. This view has been further explained and defended by Ideler in his Chronological Researches. Wieseler mentions, that, according to the statement of Münter, the Chinese astronomical tables record the appearance of a new star at a time which coincides with the fourth year before the birth of Christ. All chronological statements relating to the birth of Christ lead, according to Wieseler's calculations, to the conclusion that Jesus was born in the year 750 from the building of Rome (four years earlier than the birth of Christ according to the usual chronology), and most probably in the month of February. The above-mentioned conjunction took place two years sooner, that is, in the year 747 and 748."

The circumstance that Herod caused all the (male) children in Bethlehem, of *two years* old and under, to be put to death, is a strong argument in favor of the supposition, that the principal star in this constellation was that which directed the magi to their search. Gerlach, in his Commentary, says: As Jesus adapted Himself to the fishermen by the miraculous draught of fishes; to the sick, by the curing of their infirmities; and to all His hearers, by parables relating to the circumstances around, and the affairs of ordinary life; so did He draw these astronomers to Himself by condescending to their favorite science.

If it be asked how Providence could employ such a deceptive art for the purpose of guiding the magi to the truth, we reply, that there is a vast difference between earlier and later astrology. Just as chemistry sprung from alchemy, and even war gave rise to the Law of Nations, so ancient pagan astrology was

the parent of our modern science of astronomy. But the tendency of all true science is to point the way to faith. A perception of the harmonious order of the firmament, and especially a knowledge of astronomy, would direct devout minds to Him who is the Centre of the spiritual solar system, to the creative Word, the Source of all order. Besides, it was not astrological inquiry which primarily determined the magi to undertake the journey to Bethlehem, but their belief in the Messiah promised to the Jews, of whom they had heard. They were men earnest in their deep longing, and believers according to the measure of preparing grace granted them. Hence their astrological knowledge was used only as the instrument of advancing and directing their faith. Thus Divine Providence might condescend even to their erroneous ideas, and cause the appearance of the constellation in the heavens to coincide with the conviction in their hearts, that the birth of the Messiah had then taken place; more especially as their mistake implied at least the general truth that the whole starry world points to Christ, and that particular law of Providence, according to which great leading events in the kingdom of God are ushered in by solemn and striking occurrences, both terrestrial and celestial. Thus, all secular knowledge, however blended with error, serves to draw heavenly minds to Christ. Error is but the husk, truth is the kernel. Accordingly, the star which was a sign to these wise men, is to us a symbol that all nature—in particular, the starry heavens, and the whole compass of natural science—if properly understood, will, under Divine guidance, lead us to deeper and stronger faith. (Comp. Heubner, "*Praktische Erklärung des Neuen Test.*," vol. i. p. 13.) The statement, that the star had *guided* the magi to Jerusalem, must be interpreted in accordance with the symbolical import of the passage. The magi, of course, availed themselves of the ordinary channels of information as to the road from the East to Jerusalem; and they went to Jerusalem on the supposition that the capital of Judæa would naturally be the birthplace of the King of the Jews. The way from Jerusalem to Bethlehem they learnt from local information, having been directed there by the scribes and by Herod. To them, however, the star still seemed to be the guide of their journey—more especially the same star which they had seen in the East when **first it rose** (for this must be the import of the singular number, *ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ*, since the phrase, "*in the East*," would require the Plural, and ἀνατολή evidently corresponds with τεχθείς), now appeared in its zenith right overhead upon Bethlehem, where the shepherds had already made known the abode of the Messiah. To their believing hearts the star seemed to stand fixed, as heaven's own light, over the long desired, though obscure and humble residence. But it is remarkable how even their astrological inferences were purged from error, and transformed into genuine faith. For, first, they found the new-born King of the Jews not at Jerusalem. Secondly, they found on the throne of Judah a worldly-minded old tyrant. Thirdly, they found the representatives of the sanctuary of Judah, and the holy city itself, indifferent and unbelieving. Fourthly, they were directed to the poor village of Bethlehem. Fifthly, in Bethlehem itself they were directed to a poor cottage. Lastly, they found, not a child of two years of age, but an infant recently born, surrounded by what betokened extreme poverty, under the care of a homeless couple, the head of which was a carpenter. All these stumbling-blocks had to be removed by the testimony of the Scriptures which they had heard, by the witness of the Spirit in their hearts, by the sublime spectacle of Mary and the holy child, and by the communications of the believing shepherds. Thus were the heathen and carnal elements in their astrological impressions effaced, and only what was true, remained. The star in the sky had guided them to the Sun of the spiritual firmament.

Ver. 2. **And are come to worship Him.**—Προσκυνεῖν, to indicate veneration, homage, submission, by prostration of the face to the ground: Gen. xix. 1; xlii. 6, etc.; Herodot. i. 134, etc. Here, as in many other places, the word is, however, to be taken as meaning adoration in the more general sense, as it evidently refers merely to religious, not to political homage.

Ver. 3. (*Herod*) **was troubled, and all Jerusalem with him,** ἐταράχθη.—Both Herod and the inhabitants of Jerusalem were struck with sinful fear. With Herod, it may have been chiefly political fear of a supposed new claimant of the throne. At the same time, he must also have felt a dread, partly religious and partly moral, of the power of religion, and of the advent of One who should judge both the nation and the world,—an event which he would naturally connect with the coming of the Messiah. Nor were the inhabitants of Jerusalem merely alarmed from apprehension of the cruelty of Herod, but because, along with him, they anticipated a conflict and a judgment of a spiritual character. Lightfoot and Berthold suppose that they were merely afraid of the calamitous times which should precede the reign of Messiah, or of the *dolores Messiæ*, as they are termed. But this could form only one element in their general and undefined dismay. Jerusalem does not go to Bethlehem,—this fact best explains the character of their fear. Gerlach reminds us of the circumstance that, "a short time before this, the Pharisees had predicted to a female relative of Herod, that her descendants would obtain the royal dignity, and that Herod and his house would be destroyed. In consequence of this prediction several of the Pharisees had been put to death. When such a tyrant was alarmed, his whole capital could not but be also alarmed."

Ver. 4. (*Herod*) **gathered together,** etc.—This refers either to an extraordinary sitting of the Sanhedrim—which is the usual opinion—or merely to a theological conference. The latter supposition seems to us the more probable, as the object of the meeting was merely a theological deliverance. It is rendered still more likely from the fact, that the third class of the members of the Sanhedrim, the elders, are not mentioned (for details, *see* Meyer, p. 65; and Winer and others, under the article *Synedrium*, or *Sanhedrim*). "The term ἀρχιερεῖς comprehends not only the actual high priest for the time (ὁ ἀρχιερεύς, כֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל, Lev. xxi. 10), but those also who had previously held the office of high priest (for at this period it was often transferred at the caprice of the Romans: Joseph. *Antiq.* xv. 3), and, probably, even the heads of the twenty-four classes of priests (1 Chron. xxiv. 6; 2 Chron. xxxvi. 14; Joseph. *Antiq.* xx. 8, 8)." The *scribes* (γραμματεῖς, סוֹפְרִים) formed a separate class in the Sanhedrim, though only a portion of them were members of it. From the union of civil and spiritual government under the Old Testament theocracy, they were at one and the same time lawyers and theologians,—interpreters of the

law in this twofold sense. Hence Luke calls them νομικοί and νομοδιδάσκαλοι. Most of them belonged to the sect of the Pharisees (*see* the article *Schriftgelehrte* in Winer). In all probability, the scribes originated not merely from the practice of employing copyists of the law and public readers in the synagogues, but were intended as a kind of successors to the prophets, in a sense modified by the circumstances of the time. The only point before the Sanhedrim on the present occasion was to specify, on theological grounds, the place where Christ should be born. No doubt, however, the scribes were aware of the reason why Herod wished to ascertain this point.

Vers. 5 and 6. **For thus it is written by the prophet:** Micah v. 1.—The passage is freely quoted from the Septuagint. In the Hebrew text the prophet says: "But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, too small to be among the thousands of Judah (צָעִיר לִהְיוֹת בְּאַלְפֵי יְהוּדָה)—[or, the central towns where the heads of thousands resided, *i.e.*, subordinate divisions of tribes]—out of thee shall come forth unto Me One who is to be ruler in Israel: whose going forth (origin) is from the first of time, from the days of eternity." The Sept. has: "And thou Bethlehem, house of Ephratah, too small to be among the thousands (ἐν χιλιάσιν) of Judah," etc. Matthew substitutes for Ephratah, "*land of Judah.*" The expression probably means district, and is analogous to that of Ephraim, or twin-district. Ephratah was the District *par excellence*—the District of Judah.—The words, **art not the least,** seem to imply a question, as if it were said: "Art thou too small? Out of thee shall come, etc. Not only art thou not too small to be one of the thousands (or central towns) in the tribe of Judah, but thou shalt be the birthplace of the King of all Israel—the King eternal." Though we have here **among the princes** for "*among the thousands,*" it must not be inferred that the Evangelist or his translator had mistaken the word אֶלֶף, a thousand (central town), for אַלּוּף, the chief of a thousand (as Meyer thinks, p. 66). In point of fact, the Evangelist here refers to a central town or thousand, only personifying it by the term "prince." Even the Rabbins admit that this passage applies to the Messiah. Indeed, the whole context, and the mysterious designation of the promised ruler, prove its Messianic reference; but chiefly, the circumstance that the Messiah to be born in Bethlehem is distinguished from the then reigning house of David.

Rule, or rather **feed,** as in the margin—ποιμανεῖ, the primitive idea of ruling a people. Homer: ποιμένες λαῶν. It is clear, from this passage, that the scribes understood the words of Micah as referring to the Messiah. So also did the Chaldee translator. Subsequently, the Jews tried to destroy this testimony by applying the prediction to Hezekiah or Zerubabel.

Ver. 7. **Privily,** λάθρα.—Quite characteristic of political suspicion. Herod evidently shared the mistake of the magi, that the birth of the child coincided with the first appearance of the star, and that, consequently, the child was then in its second year. This error led to the slaughter of the children at Bethlehem.

Ver. 9. **And, lo, the star.**—Bengel infers from this passage, without sufficient reason, "*toto itinere non viderant stellam.*" The only difference was, that the star was now in its zenith, and hence *appeared* to go before them. According to a common Eastern custom, they travelled by night (Hasselquist, "*Reise nach Palästina,*" p. 152). From this circumstance, however, we are warranted in supposing that Herod received the magi at night, in order to question, and to give them such directions as would make them, unconsciously, spies, and subservient to his murderous purpose. Immediately on leaving the despot's palace, they set out on their journey.

Ver. 11. **Into the house.**—This no more proves (as Meyer asserts) that Matthew represents Bethlehem as Joseph's permanent place of residence, than ver. 1 shows that the magi did not arrive till long after the birth of the Saviour. In all probability the holy family removed, soon after the homage of the shepherds, from the stable (or the caravansery) to some shepherd's cottage. The event here alluded to undoubtedly occurred soon after the birth of Jesus, and before His presentation in the temple.

Opened their treasures.—The bags or boxes containing their treasures. According to Oriental usage, offerings are presented when welcoming a distinguished stranger, but especially on rendering homage to a sovereign. The *gold* indicates wealth; the *frankincense* and *myrrh* point to the East, more particularly to Arabia. *Frankincense*, a resin of bitter taste, but fragrant odor, was used chiefly in sacrifices and in the services of the temple. On the tree from which frankincense was derived in Arabia and India, comp. Winer. *Myrrh*, an aromatic of a similar kind, was produced from a shrub, which, indigenous in Arabia and Ethiopia, grows also in Palestine. Myrrh was employed for fumigation and for improving the taste of wine, but especially as an ingredient of a very precious ointment. For a fuller account of these productions, see Winer and other Encycl.—These gifts have been regarded as symbolical. Thus Theophylact: The gold to the King, the incense to the Lord, the myrrh to Him who was to taste of death (the great High Priest). Similarly Leo the Great. Fulgentius: *Per aurum Christi regnum, per thus ejus pontificatus, per myrrham mors significatur.* Others give other explanations. Leo the Great and Juvencus suggest, that by these gifts the magi owned and did homage to both the divine and the human nature of Christ. Others have dwelt more on the practical utility of the gifts, as a provision for the holy family in their impending flight into Egypt. With this view we may, also, combine a symbolical interpretation of the threefold gift. Thus the myrrh, as precious ointment, may indicate the Prophet and the balm of Israel; the incense, the office of the High Priest; the gold, the splendor of royalty. In expatiating, however, on supposed symbolical meanings, great care is required to avoid mere trifling.

Ver. 12. **And being warned of God,** χρηματισθέντες.—The Vulgate: *responso accepto.*—The expression seems to imply a previous inquiry. Bengel: *Sic optarant, vel rogarant.* Hence we infer that, even before being warned in a dream, the former trustfulness and simplicity of the magi—so characteristic of these inquirers—had given place to suspicion of Herod's intentions, from the contrast between the uncomfortable impression produced by the despotic king and the spiritual feelings awakened by the holy family. The word ἀνεχώρησαν is also significant: *they withdrew, escaped*, by another way to their own country. Their direct way home would, in all probability, have led by Jerusalem, as the route would depend not so much on the direction in which their country lay, as on the road usually taken by travellers.

General Remarks on the Historical Character of the Adoration of the Magi.—The idea (still, it would

seem, countenanced, as in Meyer's "Commentary," p. 79) that the preceding narrative was no more than a legend, is not only theologically untenable, but scientifically antiquated. The deep significant and symbolical meaning is no argument against the historical truth of this Gospel narrative, but rather an additional evidence of its reality. (See "*Leben Jesu*," vol. i. p. 41.) At any rate, if this narrative be a legend, it cannot be supposed to have been of Jewish Christian origin: it portrays Judaism in a most disadvantageous light compared with the Gentile world. It is remarkable that the Evangelist Luke, the companion of Paul, the Apostle of the Gentiles, introduces Jewish worthies as celebrating the praises of the new-born Messiah; while Matthew, whose Gospel was primarily intended for the use of Jewish converts, dwells upon the homage paid to the Saviour by Gentiles. This accounts for the circumstance, that in the Ebionite Hebrew Gospel, not only the first chapter, which records the miraculous birth, but also the second, was omitted. "Chalcidius, a Platonic philosopher and a heathen, but according to others a deacon of Carthage, also relates this narrative in his *Commentar ad Timæum Plat.* See *Opera Hippolyti*, ed. Fabric. xi. 825."—Heubner. The same writer (Heubner) refers to Hamann: "*Die Kreuzzüge des Philologen*," vol. ii. p. 158; and to Lilienthal: "*Die gute Sache der göttlichen Offenbarung*," v. 271 and x. 598.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. In the first chapter, the Evangelist points out the part which the *Jewish* people had in connection with the Messiah. Christ's genealogy, and His birth from the Virgin, show that salvation was of the Jews. The second chapter, which records the arrival of magi from the East, presents the interest of the *Gentile* world in Christ. The magi are, so to speak, the representatives of those pious Gentiles whose names are recorded in the Old Testament,—Melchisedec, Jethro, Ruth, Hiram, Job, Naaman, etc. To this class also belong, in a certain sense, Nebuchadnezzar and Cyrus. The same thread continues to run through the New Testament history, where we meet with the three believing centurions and other pious Gentiles, and where the vision of a Gentile—the man of Macedonia—summons the Apostle to carry the Gospel into Europe, Acts xvi. 9. Thus the first chapter of our Gospel illustrates the hereditary blessing as contrasted with the hereditary curse; while the second proves, that although the heathen were judicially given up to their own ways, there was among them in all ages a certain longing after, and knowledge of, the Saviour (Rom. i.). The Jewish hereditary blessing and the Gentile aspirations of nature together belong to what the Church calls the *gratia præveniens*, or prevenient grace. Among those who enjoyed the hereditary blessing, prevenient grace was continued in genealogical succession. They were a *chosen race*. In the Gentile world, the hope of a Saviour was planted here and there in *chosen individuals*. Yet, these two classes of believers are not entirely distinct from each other. Even the Gentile world was favored with bright glimpses of Messianic tradition; while among the Jews, also, "prevenient grace," in its highest manifestations, was accorded to chosen individuals, in whom it led to personal faith. In both these respects the scholastic view of Augustine (not of the Church in general) lags far behind the scriptural record of the riches of grace and of faith, and needs modification. The manifestation of Christ among the Gentiles, or the Epiphany (ἐπιφάνεια) of Scripture, is infinitely more grand and full than the mediæval festival of the Epiphany. Still, the latter was a solemn testimony to the wondrous efficacy of preparing grace, or the λόγος σπερματικός, to whom the ancient Greek Fathers (especially Justin Martyr and Clement of Alexandria) have borne such ample testimony.

The dark side of the picture in the first chapter consists mainly in the power of the heathen world, which, like a frightful storm, seems to pass over the genealogical tree of the Messiah. This is reversed in the second chapter, where the Gentile world presents the bright, while unbelieving Israel forms the dark side of the picture.

2. Some of the statements contained in the second chapter seem, at first sight, to be stumbling-blocks to our faith:—Christ so remote, so hidden, so disowned,—Christ at first a child in the world, a poor child, in a rural district at a distance from Jerusalem, in a lowly abode—a fugitive, an occasion of martyrdom, a Nazarene. On the other hand, we have here also an array of historical events which show Him to be the Christ; such as the star, nature, science, and philosophy,—history, on its dark side and on its bright (Herod and the theological lore of the scribes),—Holy Scripture, prophecy, the giving up of His kindred, the significant dream by night, God's overruling providence,—all forming one glorious wreath of evidence. On the analogy presented by the humble church of Bethlehem, in Prague, where John Huss preached, and the insignificant church where Luther taught at Wittenberg, see Heubner, on *Math.* p. 14.

3. The star which the wise men saw must not be regarded as a fulfilment of Balaam's prophecy respecting the Star that was to come out of Jacob (Num. xxiv. 17); for Christ Himself was that Star. The star seen by the wise men was, however, a symbol of the true Star, the Sun of Righteousness (Malachi). The arrival of those distinguished magi to do homage to the Messiah was clearly a beginning of the fulfilment of ancient prophecy, according to which the princes of the Gentiles were to come and present their homage to the Messiah (Ps. lxxii. 10; Isa. lx. 3, etc.). In a symbolical sense, they may therefore be appropriately called the three kings from the East. They were spiritual princes from the Gentile world, bearing testimony by their gifts to the dim yet real longing after a Prophet, Priest, and King, in those whom they represented.

4. In the design of Herod the old enmity of Edom against Jacob seems to reappear. We are involuntarily reminded of that murderous purpose, "I will slay my brother Jacob" (Gen. xxvii. 41), which Esau relinquished in his own person, but bequeathed to his posterity (see the prophet Obadiah), and which attained its fulfilment in the progress of history. The same may be said of the blessing which Jacob bestowed upon Esau; which also was most markedly fulfilled in the Idumæan rule over Israel, except that the noble traits in the character of Esau—his honesty and uprightness—are no longer traceable in the cruel and crafty Idumæan dynasty.

5. The antagonism between the Maccabees and the Herodians belongs to the great tragic contrasts in the history of the kingdom of God. The most touching incident in this drama is the sad fate of Mariamne, the Asmonæan princess, whom Herod married, passionately loved, but sacrificed to his suspicions. Rückert (the poet), in his *Herod*, well describes the Hellenizing and worldly spirit of this prince, who covered even Palestine with Greek names. The policy of these two dynasties may well serve as a beacon to the nations of Christendom. If the policy of the Maccabees was at a later period followed by the Byzantine court, that of the Herodians is too well known in modern times as Macchiavellianism.

6. The contrast between the faith of the Gentiles

and the unbelief of the Jews, here presented in its leading features, has been fully verified in the course of history. See Rom. ix.-xi. The Gospel of the Epiphany is also the Gospel of Missions to the Heathen.

7. Heaven and earth, as it were, move around the holy child as around their centre. But this centre repels whatever is dark and evil by the same force with which it attracts every germ of what is noble and holy.

8. The higher and spiritual import attaching to the designation, "King of the Jews," appears even from the conduct of Herod. In his mind, the expression is evidently equivalent with Messiah, and connected with spiritual rather than with temporal functions; otherwise the inquiry of the magi would have been treated as sedition.

9. For a time it was thought that the holy child had been put to death in Bethlehem, or else that He had forever quitted the scene and settled in Egypt. Next we find Him growing up in obscurity at Nazareth. Thus Christ may be regarded as the Prince of outcast children, such as Ishmael, Moses, Cyrus, Romulus, etc.

10. On the spread of the knowledge of Christ among the Persians and Mohammedans, comp. Heubner, p. 17.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The salvation of the world in the form of a child —1. concealed, and yet well known; 2. a child hated and feared, yet longed for and loved; 3. signally despised, and yet marvellously honored; 4. beset by extreme dangers, and yet kept in perfect safety.—The holy child viewed as the moving centre of the world in motion,—1. setting everything in motion; 2. attracting all that is congenial; 3. repelling all that is hostile. Christ had come to the wise men before they came to Him,—or the mysterious working of prevenient grace.—The threefold knowledge of Christ in the Gentile world: 1. Information by tradition; 2. a star in the sky; 3. the influence of the Spirit in the heart.—On the Gentile world also a star, if no brighter light, shed its lustre.—The star of heaven and the star of earth.—In what sense are the wise men from the East to be regarded as really kings from the Gentile world?—In preaching to the heathen, let us bear in mind that there is a star in their firmament.—Let us go and meet the Gentiles.—Even the best among the heathen may serve as evidence of the spiritual destitution and need of the heathen world.—The clearest light among the heathen is but starlight.—Candid philosophy must lead to Christ.—Genuine science, if true to its aim, points to the centre of all knowledge.—Every department of knowledge a mere potsherd, unless completed by faith.—Nature's testimony to Christ. 1. The various stages in nature tending *upward* to what is spiritual, or to Christ. 2. By the travailing and groaning in pain of all nature, she points *forward* to salvation in Christ. 3. Through the varied imagery and symbols of nature, she points *homeward* to the spirit.—How everything replies to the inquiry: Where is He that has been born King of the Jews? 1. Scripture. 2. The scribes. 3. Even the enemies of the King Himself. 4. The star in the sky. 5. The convictions of the heart.—Infinite importance of the question: Where is the new-born King of the Jews? 1. Its deep meaning. 2. The eager interest attaching to it. 3. The glorious hope connected with it.—The glory of the King of the Jews. 1. He is the King of the Jews, or the Messiah; 2. the King of all nations, or the Saviour of the world; 3. the King of kings and Lord of lords.—Jesus is still the King of the Jews,—a watchword for our missionary enterprise.—The King of the Jews is not to be found at Jerusalem, the city of the King.—The alarm of a tyrant spreads terror among his subjects.—Even inquiry after Christ alarms an unbelieving world.—The hatred of the wicked must serve as testimony to the truth of the Gospel.—Herod consulting Scripture as if it had been a heathen oracle.—The value of lifeless orthodoxy, and the worthlessness of lifeless theologians.—Those who are near are often afar off, and those who are afar off near.—The callous and unmoved guides to Bethlehem.—Without the light of Scripture, all the stars in the sky will not suffice to clear away our darkness.—If we but truly know that Christ has come, we shall soon learn *where* He is to be found.—The Gentile magi and the Jewish scribes. 1. The former obtain, by their star, the Scriptures also; the latter lose, with the Scriptures, also the star. 2. The former become scribes (or learned in the Scriptures) in the best sense; the latter magi, in the worst sense.—Jerusalem and Bethlehem, formerly and now.—Bethlehem and Nazareth.—Inconsistency in the character of Herod. 1. Belief in the letter of Scripture. 2. Unbelief in the spirit of Scripture. —The evil craft of Herod, and the pious simplicity of the magi.—Hypocrisy as the shadow of faith in the world. 1. It accompanies faith, as the shadow the substance. 2. It is a proof of the existence of faith, as the shadow is of the substance. 3. It vanishes before faith, as the shadow before the substance.—The devices of hypocrisy in their might and in their impotence. 1. They are mighty in the world. 2. They become powerless before the power of God.—Hypocrisy in its two most hideous forms: 1. As unprincipled religious policy; 2. as unprincipled political religiousness.—The road to Christ, and the decisive conflicts by the way: 1. It is always a long journey; 2. it always continues the grand question; 3. it is always a path of severe self-denial; 4. always a path full of dangers; 5. always a path abounding in obstacles; 6. always the only path to the true goal.—Recompense of perseverance in the path to Christ—great joy.—The star always rests over the place where Christ is.—"*And they went into the house.*" 1. What is suggested to us by the house? 2. What is suggested by those who entered? 3. What is suggested by their entering?—The homage of the wise men a sudden outburst of heartfelt blessed faith: 1. In their beholding Christ; 2. in their falling down and doing obeisance; 3. in their cordial homage, indicated by the noblest gifts.—The homage of the wise men indicating the order and succession of believing experience. 1. We behold. 2. We fall down. 3. We present gifts.—The homage of the wise men a picture of genuine and matured faith. 1. Vision issuing in humiliation and godly sorrow. 2. Adoration issuing in the joy of faith. 3. Perseverance of faith issuing in self-dedication and works of love.—The child with Mary, his mother; but not Mary, the mother, with her child (Maryolatry).—The offerings of a grateful faith; gold, frankincense, and myrrh: 1. as the noblest, 2. the most varied, 3. the most significant gifts.—The offering of a grateful hand, an expression of the dedication of the heart.—The earthly gifts of Christian gratitude reflecting the heavenly gift of the Lord.—We are to offer unto the Lord that which we have.—Prophetic dreams in the history of the kingdom of God.—Bless-

ed faith, with its songs of the night.—The sleep of the pious more profitable than the vigils of godless craftiness.—The discoveries of faith are not meant for Herod nor for such as he.—The marvellous manner in which spiritual inquiry is directed from the native darkness of this world to the light of our eternal home.—God's guidance is always toward Christ. —If God guide us, we shall always and certainly reach the goal.—The blessed return home.—Significance of Christ's first possession in connection with His first flight. It came, 1. at the right time; 2. into the proper hands; 3. for the right purpose.—The first property of the Church in its significance with reference to all Church property in the world: 1. It should be regarded as belonging to Christ; 2. it should be applied to the service of Christ; and thus, 3. become a true blessing from Christ.—Divine providence most clearly manifesting itself in its care over the life of Christ.—Christianity universal in its nature and aim. It comprehends: 1. heaven and earth; 2. nature and Scripture; 3. the Gentiles and the Jews; 4. the heart and the life; 5. redemption and judgment.

Heubner:—Christ in the cradle was the terror of an unjust monarch on his throne.—The kings and governments of this world may well tremble, and feel themselves insecure, if they are hostile to Christ. —Christ is still both the hope of the pious, and the terror of the wicked, whose conscience everywhere apprehends an avenger, and is alarmed by every passing event.—The living Saviour always puts old Adam in terror, and threatens to drive him from his throne.—Inconsistencies in the character of Herod: Faith in the letter of Scripture,—resistance to God's decrees.—We have here an instance of persons who point out Christ to others, without going to Him themselves,—who teach others the way of salvation, without entering on it themselves.—The wicked employ religion only as a means for their own ends.—The most blessed discovery of all is to have found Christ.—Edification to be derived from the history of the wise men. They were, 1. wise men—philosophers: Thus should all who are truly wise, etc. 2. Rich and noble: Thus should all the great of the earth, etc. 3. Strangers from a strange country: Thus we who are near to Christ, etc. 4. They saw Christ only as a child in His lowliness; we, on the contrary, etc. 5. They followed a small star; but our light is, etc. 6. They had a long and arduous journey to accomplish; but we scarce require to move a single step.—The glory shed on Jesus by the arrival of the wise men.—He who follows the feeble glimmerings of spiritual light, will receive divine guidance to perfect light.—*True Occult Science.*

LITERATURE: Two sermons on the Epiphany by St. Augustin and Gregory of Nazianzen, in Augusti: "Collection of Patristic Sermons," vol. i., p. 100.—Luther's "Sermon on the Gospel of the Three Kings" (the wise men).—Dispositions of Rambach, Reinhard, etc., in Schaller's "Homilet. Repert.," p. 48.—F. Mallet: *The Wise Men of the East. A Christmas Gift.* Bremen, 1852 (10 Meditations).

[Trench: *Christ the Desire of all Nations, or the Unconscious Prophecies of Heathendom.* A Commentary on Matt. ii. 1–11. 4th ed., Cambridge, 1854.—P. S.]

For *Missionary Festivals:* Christ the desire and goal of all nations.—The star of the wise men.—*Ahlfeld:* The Gentiles, too, shall walk in the light of Christ.—*Uhle:* The first Gentiles, who sought the Lord.—*Rudelbach:* The glory of the manifestation of Christ.

B. CHAPTER II. 13–23 (Luke ii. 40–52).

(*The Gospel for the Sunday after New Year or Day of Circumcision.*)

13 And when they were departed, behold, the [an] angel of the Lord appeareth to Jo-
seph in a dream, saying, Arise, and take the young child and his mother, and flee into
Egypt, and be thou there until I bring thee word: for Herod will seek the young
14 child to destroy him. When he arose, he took the young child and his mother by
15 night, and departed into Egypt, And was there until the death of Herod: that it might
be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Out of Egypt have I
16 called my son. Then Herod, when he saw that he was mocked of [by] the wise men,
was exceeding wroth, and sent forth, and slew all the children[1] that were in Bethlehem,
and in all the coasts thereof,[2] from two years old and under, according to the time
17 which he had diligently inquired of the wise men. Then was fulfilled that which was
18 spoken by Jeremy[3] the prophet, saying, In Rama was there a voice heard,[4] lamentation,
and weeping, and great mourning, Rachel weeping *for* her children, and would not be
19 comforted, because they are not. But when Herod was dead, behold, an angel of the
20 Lord appeareth in a dream to Joseph in Egypt, Saying, Arise, and take the young child
and his mother, and go into the land of Israel: for they are dead which [who] sought
21 the young child's life. And he arose, and took the young child and his mother, and
22 came into the land of Israel. But when he heard that Archelaus did reign [reigned]
in Judea in the room of his father Herod, he was afraid to go thither: notwithstand-
ing, [and] being warned of God in a dream, he turned aside into the parts of Galilee:
23 And he came and dwelt in a city called Nazareth: that it might be fulfilled which was
spoken by the prophets, He shall be called a Nazarene.

[1] Ver. 16.—[Better: *all the male children*, *πάντας τοὺς παῖδας*. Lange: *alle Knaben*.—P. S.]
[2] Ver. 16.—[*In all its borders, in all the neighborhood.*]
[3] Ver. 17.—[Jeremiah.]
[4] Ver. 18.—[Proper order: *A voice was heard in R.* Comp. Jer. xxxi. 15. The best editions omit *θρῆνος καί*, *lamentation and*.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 13. **Behold, an angel of the Lord appeareth.**—Though the wise men had withdrawn from the influence of Herod, the child was still in danger. It may be presumed that the wise men and the child's parents had conversed together about Herod, and that the magi had begun to entertain strong suspicions of his intentions. Probably Joseph and Mary were to some extent relieved when the wise men left the country without returning to Herod. Still, the anxious vigilance of Joseph continued unabated; and it may be regarded as an evidence of his devotedness, that he again received instruction and direction by a vision in a dream. He did not hesitate for a moment, but immediately fled with the child and its mother.

Vers. 14, 15. **Egypt** was the only possible place of refuge. It was situated near the southern frontier of Judæa. Following this direction, the fugitives at once withdrew to a distance from Jerusalem. Frequented roads led through the desert into Egypt. There they would find a large and more liberal Jewish community under the protection of a civilized government. The supposition that this account was invented for the purpose of fulfilling the passage in Hosea xi. 1 (which, in the text, is quoted in accordance with the original Hebrew), is entirely incompatible with the scope and meaning of the narrative. Even supposing the story to be legendary, it would have ill accorded with the anxiety of Joseph and Mary about the child to represent them as undertaking a journey for the purpose of fulfilling a prophecy; especially one which, in its literal sense, referred to the bringing of Israel out of Egypt (comp. Ex. iv. 22; Jer. xxxi. 9). The Septuagint translation has τὰ τέκνα αὐτοῦ (of Israel). As, however, the flight and the return had really taken place, the Evangelist, whose attention was always directed to the fulfilment of prophecy, might very properly call attention to the fact, that even this prediction of Hosea had been fulfilled. And, in truth, viewed not as a verbal but as a typical prophecy, this prediction was fulfilled by the flight into Egypt. Israel of old was called out of Egypt as the son of God, inasmuch as Israel was identified with the Son of God. But now the Son of God Himself was called out of Egypt, who came out of Israel as the kernel from the husk. When the Lord called Israel out of Egypt, it was with special reference to His Son; that is, in view of the high spiritual place which Israel was destined to occupy. In connection with this, it is also important to bear in mind the historical influence of Egypt on the world at large. Ancient Greek civilization—nay, in a certain sense, the imperial power of Rome itself—sprung from Egypt; in Egypt the science of Christian theology and Christian monasticism originated; from Egypt proceeded the last universal conqueror; out of Egypt came the typical son of God to found the theocracy; and thence also the true Son of God, to complete the theocracy.—According to tradition, Christ stayed at Matarea in Egypt, in the vicinity of Leontopolis, where, at a later period, the Jewish temple of Onias stood.—*See* Schubert's *Reise in das Morgenland*, ii. p. 179.

Ver. 16. **That he was mocked,** ἐνεπαίχθη—*outwitted, made a fool of.*—The word is frequently so used in the Septuagint. "The expression is here employed from Herod's point of view."

From two years old, ἀπὸ διετοῦς, sc. παιδός.—From two years old down to the youngest male child on the breast. It follows that the star had been seen by the wise men for about two years before their arrival at Jerusalem. The massacre of the children at Bethlehem has been regarded as a myth, chiefly because Josephus makes no mention of it. Thus even Meyer doubts the historical truth of this narrative, since Josephus always relates circumstantially all the cruelties perpetrated by Herod (*Antiq.* xv. 7, 8, etc.). But that he recorded so many, scarcely implies that he meant to relate every instance of his cruelty. It is further argued, that, if the massacre has "been a historical fact, it would, on account of the peculiar circumstances of the case, certainly have been mentioned by the Jewish historian." We infer the opposite. From the peculiarity of the occurrence, it would have been impossible to mention it without furnishing a more direct testimony, either for or against the Christian faith, than Josephus wished to bear. The supposition that the massacre was not openly and officially ordered, but secretly perpetrated by banditti in the employ of Herod (see *Leben Jesu*, ii. p. 112), is *not* "gratuitous," but suggested by the text (λάθρα ἠκρίβωσε; ἀποστείλας ἀνεῖλεν). Not that we draw any inference from the confused account in Macrobius * (see Meyer, p. 174); the Gospel narrative can, however, easily dispense with it.

Vers. 17, 18. **Then was fulfilled,** *etc.*—The prediction in Jer. xxxi. 15 is here quoted freely from the Septuagint. This is another fulfilment of a typical, not of a literal, prophecy. The passage primarily refers to the deportation of the Jews to Babylon. Rachel, the ancestress of Benjamin, who was buried near Bethlehem, is introduced as issuing from her grave to bewail the captivity of her children. The sound of her lamentations is carried northward beyond Jerusalem, and heard at Rama—a fortress of Israel on the frontier toward Judah, where the captives were collected. The meaning probably is, that the grief caused by this deportation, and the consequent lamentations of the female captives, was such as to reach even the heart of the ancestress of Benjamin (which here includes also Judah). As used by Jeremiah, it was, therefore, a figurative expression for the deep sorrow of the exiled mothers of Judah. But in the massacre of the infants of Bethlehem this earlier calamity was not only renewed, but its description verified in the fullest and most tragic manner. Rachel's children are not merely led into exile; they are destroyed, and that by one who called himself King of Israel. Accordingly, Rachel is introduced as the representative of the mothers of Bethlehem lamenting over their children (Chrysostom, Theophylact, and many others). The picture of Rachel herself issuing from the grave and raising a lament, indicates that the greatest calamity had now befallen Judah.—The words θρῆνος καί are wanting in Codd. B.Z., etc., and in several translations.

Ver. 20. **They are dead who,** *etc.*—In the vision a scriptural expression is used, Ex. iv. 19, which must have been familiar to Joseph. On the horrible death of Herod, amid alternate designs of revenge and fits of despair, comp. Joseph. *Antiq.* xvii. 18, 1; 9, 3; *De Bello Jud.* 1, 33. He died at the age of 70, in the 37th year of his reign.

Ver. 22. **But when he heard that Archelaus,** *etc.*—After the death of Herod, his kingdom was divided among his three sons by Augustus. Archelaus

* Of Augustus: "Cum audisset, inter pueros, quos in Syria Herodes, rex Judaeorum intra bimatum jussit interfici, filium quoque ejus occisum, ait, melius est Herodis porcum esse, quam filium."

obtained Judæa, Idumæa, and Samaria; Herod Antipas, Galilee and Peræa; Philip, Batanea, Trachonitis, and Auranitis. Herod and Philip received the title of *Tetrarch.* Archelaus obtained at first the designation of *Ethnarch* (Joseph. *Antiq.* xvii. 11, 4). The title of King was to be afterward conferred on him if he deserved it by his services. But, nine years after his accession, Augustus banished him, in consequence of the complaints of the Jews about his cruelty, to Vienne in Gaul, where he died (*Antiq.* xvii. 13, 2; *De Bello Jud.* ii. 7, 3). Like his father, Archelaus was a suspicious and cruel tyrant. Accordingly, Joseph was afraid to remain in Judæa with the holy child. Applying to the Lord for guidance, he was directed, in another dream, to settle in Galilee. This was the fourth revelation with which he was honored. It implies that a high tone of spirituality pervaded his soul. The ever-watchful solicitude of Joseph for the safety of the child of promise might serve as the natural groundwork for these communications, while the repeated revelations vouchsafed during his nocturnal thoughts show that a *providentia specialissima* watched over the life of the Divine child. Such prophetic dreams exhibit the connection and coöperation of a special Divine providence with the most anxious vigilance on the part of the servants of God. Nor must we forget the connection between the devotedness of Joseph and the fond anxiety of Mary.—These four dreams occurred at considerable intervals of time.

Ver. 23. **A city called Nazareth.**—The town was situated in Lower Galilee, in the ancient territory of the tribe of Zebulon (Lightfoot, *Horæ Hebr.* p. 918), to the south of Cana, not far from Mount Tabor. It lay in a rocky hollow among the mountains, and was surrounded by beautiful and grand scenery. The modern Nazareth is a small, but pretty town. According to Robinson, it has three thousand inhabitants (see Schubert iii. 169; Robinson, iii. 421, Eng. ed. ii. 333; and other books of travels). Compare also the article in Winer and other Encycls. The name of *Galilee* was derived from גָּלִיל, which originally signifies a circle,—hence *Galilee,* the circuit or surrounding country. The whole country received its name from the district, which was afterward named *Upper* Galilee, as distinguished from *Lower* Galilee. Accordingly, in common conversation, the term Galilee was used to denote Upper Galilee, or the Galilee *par excellence.* This explains such expressions as Matt. iv. 12 and John iv. 44. One might be said to go from Nazareth to Galilee, just as we might speak of travelling from Berlin to Prussia (Proper), or from Geneva to (the interior of) Switzerland. "The word *Nazareth* is supposed to be derived from נֵצֶר, *surculus, virgultum,* as the surrounding district abounds in brushwood or shrubs; Burckhardt, '*Reisen,*' ii. 583 (Matt. ii. 23 is an allusion to נֵצֶר, *surculus,* in Isa. xi. 1, which Hofmann, in his '*Weissagung,*' ii. 64, denies on insufficient grounds)." *Winer.*

He shall be called a Nazarene.—As the word Nazarene is not employed in any prophetic passage of the Old Testament to designate the Messiah, various explanations have been proposed:—1. According to Jerome, some "eruditi Hebræi" had before his time traced the term to the expression נֵצֶר, sprout, in Isa. xi. 1, by which the Messiah is designated; which view is followed by many modern expositors, as also by Piscator and Casaubon. Hengstenberg, in his Christology, ii. 1, supports this explanation, by showing that the original name of the place was נצר, and not נצרת. 2. Chrysostom, and many others after him, consider the words in question a quotation from a prophetic book now lost. But in quoting from the Old Testament, the inspired penmen evidently regarded the Old Testament canon as closed, and referred only to books which had been received into it. This also disposes of the opinion that, 3. The quotation is from some apocryphal book (Gratz, Ewald). Still more untenable is, 4. the notion that the term Nazarene is equivalent to נָזִיר. For Jesus was neither a Nazarite (Matt. xi. 19), nor is He so called in any prophetic passage. This vague conjecture is rendered even more improbable by the suggestion of Ewald, that the quotation was taken from a lost apocryphal book, in which the Messiah was represented at His first appearance as a Nazarite, and that from this verbal similarity the Evangelist had derived his reference to Nazareth. 5. Some commentators have given up the idea of a verbal reference. They argue that the expression Nazarene was used by the Jews to designate a slighted person; and the Messiah is represented as such in Ps. xxii., Isa. liii. (Michaelis, Paulus, Rosenmüller, etc.; comp. the author's *Leben Jesu,* vol. ii. p. 48). This, or the explanation (1) proposed by Jerome, seems the most likely. Meyer supports the allusion to נֵצֶר by referring to the similar expression צֶמַח (Isa. iv. 2; Jer. xxiii. 5, xxxiii. 15; Zech. iii. 8, vi. 12), which would also account for the use of the plural number—"spoken by the *prophets.*" But it seems to us impossible to suppose that the allusion of the Evangelist should have been based merely on the *similarity,* and not on the *meaning* of the two words. Such a view could neither be reconciled with the suggestion of Meyer about *Zemach,* nor would it tally with Isa. xi. 1, where the term נצר is used only in allusion to, but not as a designation of the Messiah; so that the idea of a mere verbal fulfilment is out of the question. The conclusion at which we have arrived is, that the title Nazarene bears reference to the outward lowliness of the Messiah; accordingly, the נֵצֶר in Isa. xi. 1 is analogous to the expressions used in Isa. liii. 2, and to other descriptions of the humble appearance of the Messiah. In other words, the various allusions to the despised and humble appearance of the Messiah are, so to speak, concentrated in that of *Nezer.* The prophets applied to Him the term *branch* or *bush,* in reference to His insignificance in the eyes of the world; and this appellation was specially verified when He appeared as an inhabitant of despised Nazareth, "the town of shrubs" (*Leben Jesu,* vol. ii. 120 ff.).

Meyer has recently repeated the assertion, that, according to the account of Matthew, Bethlehem, and not Nazareth, was the original residence of Joseph and Mary; and that, in this respect, there is a discrepancy between Matthew and Luke. This commentator controverts the view of Neander, Ebrard, Hoffmann, and others, who have successfully, as we think, reconciled the statements of the two Evangelists (see *Leben Jesu,* ii. 122). In reply, it may be sufficient to say, that in all probability Joseph and Mary deemed it their duty to reside at Bethlehem after the birth of Jesus until otherwise directed, more especially as the magi had been directed to Bethlehem in their search after the Messiah. Indeed, Matthew himself furnishes the key for solving the apparent difficulty, when he mentions it as a new circumstance that the birth of Christ took place "at Bethlehem." A discrepancy could only have been alleged if Joseph and Mary had, in the first chapter, been represented as residing at Bethlehem. On the other hand, it is easy to account for the special notice of the town of Nazareth in the passage before us, as the Evangelist wished to call attention to the cir

cumstance of Christ's residence at Nazareth, and to the prophetic allusions thereto.

The following appears to have been the *chronological order* of events:—Soon after the birth of Christ the wise men arrived from the East. This was followed by the flight into Egypt, and the sojourn there, which must have been very brief, as Herod's death occurred soon afterward. The presentation in the temple must have taken place after the return, as, according to the law, it could not occur before the fortieth day, but did not necessarily take place on that day. After the presentation, Joseph and Mary settled in Galilee; and there, at Nazareth, the Lord resided for thirty years (see my *Leben Jesu*, vol. ii. 110).

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. Joseph's dreams, in which angelic communications were made for the deliverance of the holy child, afford us a glimpse into the spiritual nature of man, and into the spiritual world beyond. A contest ensues between the kingdom of light and the kingdom of darkness about the holy child. The craft of Herod assumes the form of satanic rage. The Jewish scribes have been successfully duped by him, and made subservient to the purposes of the tyrant. By their scriptural reply to his inquiry they have unconsciously delivered the infant Messiah into the power of the crafty monarch. But the deep and earnest spirituality of the pious heathen worshippers proved sufficient to defeat his plans. Warned of God in a dream, they escaped from the meshes of his iniquitous policy. By an unusual route they returned into their own country, and, to appearance, the holy child was safe. But Herod's fury knew no bounds. The thought of having been outwitted by the magi was an additional incitement to wreak his vengeance on the object of their veneration. He now employed a band of ruffians as the instruments of his last desperate attempt on the life of Jesus. No doubt he expected that in the slaughter of the infants of Bethlehem the infant Jesus would perish. Thus did the kingdom of darkness put forth its utmost efforts, which, on the other hand, were counteracted by those of the kingdom of light. But if the powers of darkness proceed warily, those of light act still more warily. The calculations of a sleepless policy were baffled by the sleep of the pious. On the nature and significancy of dreams, see Schubert's *Symbolik des Traumes;* and the author's dissertation entitled: "*Von dem zwiefachen Bewusstsein,*" etc., in the "*Deutsche Zeitschrift für christliche Wissenschaft und christliches Leben,*" Berlin, 1851, N. 30 ff. On angelical communications, see the author's *Leben Jesu*, i. 48.

In regard to the influence of the spiritual world on the human mind, the following principle may be laid down: The more vividly the soul is roused in its inmost being by wants and perplexities around, the more are we prepared for influences from the spiritual world, good or evil, according to the spiritual condition of the soul. Again, in proportion as the spiritual condition of the soul is undeveloped, though earnest in its aspirations after God, or as a person is engrossed with cares and toils in the ordinary course of his life, the more likely is the influence of the spiritual world to be felt in dreams and visions of the night. As instances in point, we may here refer to the ecstatic state of Hagar, of Gideon, of Mary Magdalene, of the Christian martyrs in the Primitive Church, of the French Camisardes, [the Scotch Covenanters], the Jansenists, and others.

2. The anxious care of Joseph for the safety of the child and its mother may be regarded as a proof that Divine Providence always raises up faithful servants to protect and to promote His own kingdom, and with it the spiritual welfare of mankind. But in this instance the salvation of the world was connected with the safety of a babe, threatened by the craft of a despot, whose dagger had on no other occasion missed its mark. Hence the care of Providence for the safety of this child was unremitting; Joseph's vigilance did not cease even in his sleep, while the mother's solicitude was undoubtedly still more eager. Every other consideration seems secondary to that of the safety of the child. Thus has the Lord ever prepared instruments for His work. By God's grace, devoted and faithful servants have never been wanting in the world, and the King Eternal has always had His faithful ones.

3. The tractate of Lactantius, *de morte persecutorum*, commences with an account of the death of Herod. It is a tale of persecution and retribution, renewed in every age.

4. The mysterious import of Egypt in the world's history appears constantly anew. "*Out of Egypt have I called My son,*" is an expression which pervades the whole course of history. But this calling implies not only the Son's residence in Egypt, but also his departure from it.

5. The wail of Rachel is here a symbol of the sympathy of the theocracy in general, called forth by the sufferings inflicted by the outward representatives of the theocracy on its genuine children. The wail of Rachel is renewed in the Church as often as the witnesses of the truth are put to death by carnal and worldly men, who profess to be the representatives of the Church.

6. We do not include the slaughtered infants of Bethlehem in the number of Christian martyrs properly so called, as they did not of their own free choice and will bear testimony to the Saviour.* They perished simply because they were male children—children of Bethlehem, under two years of age. Still, they have been justly considered the prototypes of Christian martyrdom (*Feast of the Innocents*, Dec. 28), as they were cut off, 1. in their innocency; 2. as children of Bethlehem, and children of the promise; 3. from hatred to Christ; 4. for the purpose of withdrawing attention from the flight of the holy child, and to secure His safety in Egypt.

7. Nazareth is the perpetual symbol of the outward lowliness and humble condition of Christ and of Christianity in the world. It is the emblem of that poverty which apparently so ill accords with the exalted nature of, and the depth of spiritual life brought to light by, the Gospel. But what to the world seems unfitting, is in reality, and in the sight of God, most fitting; for Christianity is based and reared on deepest humility. Hence the path by which God leads His elect is first downward, and then upward; both the descent and the ascent increasing as they proceed, as we see in the history of Jacob, of Joseph, of Moses, of David, and of others. The prophets were fully and experimentally acquainted with this fundamental principle of the Divine government. Hence they prophesied of the lowliness

* [The Church distinguishes and celebrates a threefold martyrdom: 1. martyrdom both *in will and in fact*,—Festival of St. Stephen the protomartyr, Dec. 26; 2. martyrdom *in will*, though not in fact,—Festival of St. John the Evangelist, Dec. 27; 3. martyrdom *in fact*, though not in will,—The Innocents' Day, Dec. 28. These three festivals follow Christmas, because Christian martyrdom was regarded as a celestial birth, which is the consequence of Christ's terrestrial birth. Christ was born on earth that His saints might be born in heaven.—On the Holy Innocents compare the old poem of Prudentius: *Salvete flores martyrum*, and John Keble's *Christian Year*, p. 47.—P. S.]

of the Messiah during the earlier period of His life, of His subsequent humiliation, and of His death at the conclusion of His earthly career.

8. In the life of children, as in that of mechanics and laborers, the mind is taken up during the day with surrounding objects. Hence their inner life during the night is more widely awake and susceptible to dreams and visions. This is the basis for the prophetic dreams of Joseph in the Old Testament, and Joseph in the New.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The homage which Christ receives is the ground of his persecution and sufferings; but persecution and sufferings always lead to more abundant glory. —The wise of this world are unable to protect Jesus and His Church. For this purpose God employs His heavenly messengers, and His despised children on earth.—Divine Providence brought to nought all the designs of the wicked against the life of the holy child.—Children as under the protection of angels.—Warning angel-voices during the course of our life.—Obedience to the voice of the Spirit.—Joseph's awakening in the morning. A short time before, he had risen to vindicate the mother: he now rises to rescue the child with its mother.—How the whole day is blessed when commenced with faith and obedience. —Joseph the model of all foster-parents.—Sacrifices for the Lord are the noblest gain.—The holy flight of the Lord in its happy results.—The holy withdrawal of the Lord the emblem of every holy withdrawal: 1. of that of the Old Testament prophets; 2. of that of Christians; 3. of the spiritual withdrawal from the world in the inner life.—Egypt, the land of *tombs*, the *cradle* of God's people.—The persecuted Church of God ever at home with the Lord: 1. in flight; 2. in the desert; 3. in a strange land. —The Lord continues, while all who rise against Him perish.—The children of Bethlehem as types of Christian martyrdom. 1. They are, so to speak, the seal of the faith of Old Testament believers in the Messiah. 2. They confirm the faith of believers in all time coming.—Christ among the children of Bethlehem. 1. They die for Him, in order to live for Him. 2. He lives for them, in order to die for them.—No expenditure of blood and tears can be too great for the rescue of Jesus: 1. because His life is the ransom of the world; 2. because His life transforms every sacrifice of blood and of tears into life and blessedness.—The death of children is of deep import in God's sight.—Lamentation in the Church of God. *a*. The cry of Abel for vengeance; *b*. Rachel's cry of sorrow; *c*. Jesus' cry of love.—"They are dead which sought the young child's life." Thus it was (1) formerly. Thus it is (2) still. Thus it will be (3) at the end of time.—Archelaus his father's son. 1. Personal guilt; 2. hereditary guilt; 3. the judgment.—The savor of despotism banishes happiness from the land.—Christ the Nazarene: 1. as an inhabitant of the earth; 2. as an inhabitant of Judæa; 3. as an inhabitant of Galilee; 4. as an inhabitant of Nazareth; 5. as the carpenter's son even in Nazareth.—The lowliness of Jesus prefigured His humiliation, but also His exaltation.—The obscurity of Christ, implying, 1. His ignominy: 2. His safety; 3. His ornament.—Jesus the great teacher of humility. The thirty years of Christ's obscurity the foundation of His three years' manifestation.—The inward unfolding of Christ had to be guarded from the influences of a corrupt world, and of corrupt ecclesiastical institutions.—Christ the Divine nursling under the fostering care, 1. of pious maternal love; 2. of the anxious solicitude of God's hidden ones; 3. of nature in all its beauty and grandeur.—Christians as Nazarenes in the train of the Nazarene.—Nazareth itself usually does not know the Nazarene.—The heavenly youth of the Lord a mystery of the earth.—The glory of God in the lowliness of Christ.—The Joseph-dreams in the Old and the New Testament.

Starke:*—Joy and suffering are at all times next-door neighbors. When faith is strengthened, trials generally ensue. The Lord knows how, at the right moment, to withdraw His own from danger, and how to anticipate the enemy.—God often wonderfully protects his own by small means and humble instrumentalities, as he protected Jesus through the instrumentality of Joseph, a carpenter.—Whoever will love the infant Christ must be prepared to endure, for His sake, every sort of tribulation.—Jesus has sanctified even the afflictions of our childhood.—No sooner are we born again from on high, than persecution arises against us.—Rejoice, ye who suffer with Christ. 1 Pet. iv. 13.—If thine own people will not bear thee, God will provide a place for thee even among strangers. Rev. xii. 4–6.—Tyrants must die, and thy sufferings will come to an end. Job v. 19.—What the enemies of the Church cannot accomplish by craft, they attempt to effect by force.—If we suffer with Christ, we shall also reign with Him. 2 Tim. ii. 11.

Heubner:—Providence watches over the life of the elect.—*Augustin*: *O parvuli beati, modo nati, nondum tentati, nondum luctati, jam coronati*.—The kingdom of light was from its very commencement assailed by the kingdom of darkness.—In times of suffering the disciples of Jesus have often been obliged to shelter their light in the retirement of secret associations, and in strange places of refuge.—Joseph an example of obedient trust in God amid signal dangers.—"Duties are ours, events are God's." (Cecil.) —Herod a warning picture of a hardened, hoary sinner.—Mary the model of suffering mothers.—What trials a pious mother may have to endure!—The early death of pious children a token of Divine favor toward them.—The wickedness and violence of men are of short duration; God will always gain the day against them.—Let us affectionately remember what protection our heavenly Father has accorded us from our youth upward.—The wonderful guidance of God experienced by the pious.—*Schleiermacher's Predigten* (vol. iv.): The narrative in the text a picture of sin, which ever attempts to arrest the progress of Christianity.—*Wimmer*: One Lord, one faith. The misery of those who harden themselves, as apparent, 1. in their anguish during life; 2. in the folly of all their measures; 3. in their despair in death.—*Reinhard*: On the dealings of God with our children.

* [The Edinb. transl. uniformly has *Starcke*, following the first edition. But Dr. Lange, in the second ed., as also in all the other vols. of the Com., changed it into *Starke*. The difference in spelling arises from an inconsistency of Starke himself, or his printer, in the various volumes of the *Synopsis Bibliothecæ Exegeticæ*. His last mode of spelling, however, was *Starke*, which is also etymologically more correct.—P. S.]

FOURTH SECTION.

ON ENTERING UPON HIS MINISTRY, JESUS REMAINED STILL UNKNOWN, EVEN TO THOSE WHO HAD HUMBLED THEMSELVES AND PROFESSED PENITENCE IN ISRAEL. IN THE BAPTISM UNTO REPENTANCE, HE RECEIVED HIS SOLEMN CONSECRATION UNTO DEATH; WHILE AT THE SAME TIME HE IS OWNED AND GLORIFIED BY THE FATHER AS HIS BELOVED SON, THE WHOLE BLESSED TRINITY SHEDDING THEIR LUSTRE AROUND HIM, AND HIS ADVENT BEING ANNOUNCED BY HIS SPECIAL MESSENGER JOHN.

CHAPTER III. (Mark i. 1-11; Luke iii. 1-22; John i. 19-34).

SUMMARY:—This section gives an account of John the Baptist as the forerunner of Jesus, and of his ministry, which commenced by calling the people to repentance, and subjecting them to a general purification, preparatory to the advent of the Messiah. His ministry culminated in the baptism of Christ Himself, whom John recognized by miraculous tokens from heaven, and proclaimed on this occasion as the Messiah. The section is divided into two parts: John as forerunner of the Lord, and as preacher and baptist,—(1) in his relation to the people; (2) in his relation to the Lord Himself, or the baptism and glorifying of Jesus. We note the marked contrast between the baptism of Jesus and that of the Pharisees and Sadducees.

A. CHAPTER III. 1-12.

1 In those days came John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness of Judea, And
3 saying, Repent ye: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand. For this is he that was
spoken of by the prophet Esaias [Isaiah], saying, The voice of one crying in the
4 wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight. And the same
John had his raiment of camel's hair, and a leathern girdle about his loins; and his
5 meat was locusts and wild honey. Then went out to him Jerusalem, and all Judea,
6 and all the region round about [the] Jordan, And were baptized of [by] him in [the]
7 Jordan, confessing their sins. But when he saw many of the Pharisees and Sadducees
come to his[1] baptism, he said unto them, O generation of vipers, who hath warned you
8 to flee from the wrath to come? Bring forth therefore fruits meet for repentance: And
9 think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to [for] *our* father: for I say unto
10 you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham. And now
also the axe is laid unto the root of the trees: therefore every tree which bringeth not
11 forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire. I indeed baptize you with [in]
water unto repentance: but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes[2] I
am not worthy to bear: he shall baptize you with [in] the Holy Ghost, and *with* fire:
12 Whose fan *is* in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his [threshing-] floor, and
gather his wheat into the garner; but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire.

[1] Ver. 7.—[Lachmann and Tregelles omit αὐτοῦ; Tischendorf retains it.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 11.—[Literally: *sandals*, i. e. *soles* merely, of wood or leather, bound under the feet; hence ὑποδήματα from ὑποδέω. But the C. V. is more generally intelligible and may be retained.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1. **In those days,** בַּיָּמִים הָהֵם, Ex. ii. 11, 23; Isa. xxxviii. 1.—This indefinite mode of marking time always refers to a preceding date. Here the reference is to the residence of Jesus at Nazareth during the period of His obscurity; the contrast being all the more striking, when we bear in mind that during that season His inner life was maturing to the full glory of His theanthropic consciousness. (For other explanations of ἐν ταῖς ἡμέρ. ἐκ. comp. Meyer, p. 79.)

From the narrative of Luke we learn that John the Baptist was about half a year older than Jesus. The dates between the commencement of Christ's ministry and that of His forerunner also correspond. It is not probable that either John or Jesus would have entered on their ministry before the completion of their thirtieth year. According to the law of Moses (Num. iv. 3, 47), the age of thirty was required for commencing the exercise of the priestly functions. The Levites (ch. viii. 24) could not enter on their duties before the age of twenty-five. Subsequently, however, this was reduced to the age of twenty (1 Chron. xxiv. 24; 2 Chron. xxxi. 17). Although there was no law confining the exercise of the *prophetic* office either to a particular age, or even to the male sex, it seems natural that persons who claimed public authority as prophets would wait till they had attained the canonical age for the priesthood. On the other hand, neither John nor Jesus could have been more than thirty when they entered on their ministry. According to this calculation, Jesus must have commenced His public career in the year 780 from the foundation of Rome (see *Leben Jesu*, vol. i. p. 161), and John a short time before. From Luke iii. 1, we infer that John began his ministry in the

fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius. But Tiberius was associated in the empire two years before the death of Augustus, that is, about the year 765. Accordingly, it is understood that Luke reckoned the reign of Tiberius from that year. This makes John's ministry commence in 779.

In the wilderness of Judah (Judg. i. 16; Josh. xv. 61).—It was also called *Jeshimon*, 1 Sam. xxiii. 19; xxvi. 1, 3. It consisted of a rocky district in the eastern portion of the territory of the tribe of Judah, toward the Dead Sea. In this district the town of Engedi, and other places mentioned in the Old Testament, were situated, Josh. xv. 62; Judg. i. 16. It terminated on the northwest in the wilderness of Thekoa; on the southeast in the wilderness of Engedi, the wilderness of Ziph, and the wilderness of Mara. See the corresponding art. in the Encycls. Tradition, however, attaches the designation of "the wilderness of John" not to the places where he exercised his ministry, but to the district where from early youth he lived in retirement (Luke i. 80). This wilderness was situated amid the mountains of Judæa, about two hours to the southwest of Bethlehem. The term "*wilderness*" (מִדְבָּר, as distinguished from עֲרָבָה, a *steppe*) was given to a district which was not regularly cultivated and inhabited, but used for pasturage (from דָּבַר, to *drive*), being generally without wood and defective in water, but not entirely destitute of vegetation.

John the Baptist.—The Hebr. name יוֹחָנָן, "the Lord graciously gave,"* is akin to the Phœnician and Punic חֲנִיבַעַל. John, the son of Zacharias the priest, and of Elizabeth (Luke i.), a near kinsman of Jesus, and only six months older than He (Luke i. 36), was born, according to rabbinical tradition, at Hebron, but according to modern expositors, at Jutta, in the tribe of Judah. From earliest childhood he was of a thoughtful disposition, and lived in retirement in the wilderness (Luke i. 80) as a Nazarite (ver. 15), agreeably to the Divine ordinance. There the spiritual gifts with which he had been enriched by the Holy Ghost, who had sanctified him from the womb, developed and took shape in conformity with his high and holy calling to prepare the way for the Messiah. In his own person he embodied, so to speak, the Old Testament dispensation in its legal bearing, just as the Virgin Mary embodied and represented the evangelical aspect of the Old Testament as set forth in Abraham and the prophets. John was the personification of Old Testament righteousness according to the law; Mary was the personification of Old Testament faith in the promise, and of deep and earnest waiting for the promised salvation. Hence John appeared in Israel as the preacher of repentance, and the baptist.† He commenced his public ministry in the wilderness of Judæa in the fifteenth year of the reign of the Emperor Tiberius, appearing in the garb, and following the manner of life, of a Nazarite. Summoning the people to repentance, he announced to them the near approach of the kingdom of heaven (the kingdom of the Messiah—Dan. xi. 44; vii. 13, 14). On the desert banks of Jordan, in the solitary district near Jericho, he began what, from its special Divine appointment, and the prophetic authority with which it was administered, was really a *new* ordinance—the *baptism unto repentance*, and admission into the kingdom of heaven, with a view to the reception of the coming Messiah. His baptism implied that the whole people were unclean, and, in their present condition, unfit for the kingdom of heaven (according to Haggai ii. 14). So far as Israel was concerned, the rite originated in the Levitical lustration appointed for the unclean (Gen. xxxv. 2; Ex. xix. 10; Num. xix. 7; Judith xii. 7; Joseph. *de bello Jud.* ii. 8, 7; Wetstein *in loc.*; Nork, *Mythologisches Wörterbuch*, Wassertaufe, etc.). But it also bore analogy to the symbolical purifications, by water and otherwise, common among the various nations of the world, and to the baptism of Jewish proselytes,* viewing these ceremonies in the light of the predictions of the prophets (Ezek. xxxvi. 25; Isa. xliv. 3; Zech. xiii. 1). This baptism was administered by immersion, and not merely by sprinkling. It denoted purification by, not only washing, but by submitting to sufferings akin to death. So far as is known, this rite was not accompanied by the usual sacrifices; but the deepest spiritual part of the sacrificial service—the confession of sins—preceded the immersion. This confession of sins, however, was not made over the head of an animal, as in the Levitical sin-offerings (Lev. xvi. 21; Num. v. 7), because the spiritual truth, that he who offered the sacrifice must himself be the sacrifice, or offer up himself, was nearing its grand realization. In one respect, however, the baptism of John resembled the sacrificial services of the priests, as John administered the rite of submersion himself; whereas, in ordinary lustrations, the person to be baptized sprinkled himself with the water of baptism. The immediate object of John's baptism was to prepare the people for the Messiah and the kingdom of heaven (Matt. iii. 11); its final and highest object, the manifestation of the Messiah to His people (John i. 31; see *Leben Jesu*, ii. 452; iii. 49). *The Lord's manifestation to John, and the public witness of the Baptist to Jesus, as the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world, completed the prophetic mission of John.* This appears from the fact, that henceforth the rite of baptism and the most distinguished of John's disciples became connected with Jesus Himself.

Meanwhile John pursued his ministry even beyond its goal, which had now been reached. His course was, in consequence, marked by some degree of hesitation, although his sole aud earnest desire

* [The German *Gotthold*, *Gottlieb*.]

† [John represents also the prophetic or evangelical element of the Old Testament religion by pointing to "the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world." He united the spirit of Moses and that of Isaiah, and stood nearest to Christ, who was the end of the law and the promise. Hence he is called the greatest among those that are born of women, and yet, as still belonging to the preparatory dispensation of the Old Testament, less than the least in the kingdom of heaven (Matt. xi. 11). The comparison is not one of personal merit, but of stand-point and official position.—P. S.]

* This view was for a long time generally entertained (for example, by Selden, Lightfoot, Danz, Ziegler, etc.); but has latterly been called in question by Schneckenburger ("*Das Alter der jüd. Proselytentaufe*," Berl. 1828), by Meyer, and others, on the ground that "the earliest mention of baptism in the case of Jewish proselytes occurs in the *Gemara Babyl. Jebamoth*, 46, 2, while neither Philo, Josephus, nor the older Targums refer to such a rite. It seems to have originated after the destruction of the temple. Before that, proselytes were admitted by circumcision and the offering of a sacrifice, which latter, like every other sacrifice, was preceded by a Levitical purification with water, which the proselyte administered to himself." But this very lustration was the germ of the later baptism of proselytes, only that it formed an adjunct of circumcision, and not of the sacrifice which was offered. After the destruction of the temple, when sacrifices ceased, the rite of baptism necessarily *acquired much greater importance* than formerly.

still was to prepare the way of the Lord, and to promote His cause (John i. 36; iii. 23; Matt. xi. 3). But the manifest contrast between the baptism of John and that of the disciples of Jesus,—between John's disciples and those of the Lord—between the rigid asceticism of the former, and the social, genial deportment of the latter,—suggested comparisons which, from the legal notions of the Jews, led to conclusions derogatory to the teaching of Christ, and, in the end, even to the rejection of both teachers. Besides, this contrast between the Old Testament type of righteousness and that of the New, subsequently gave rise to odious dissensions, and at a later period induced some of the disciples of John to abandon Jesus, and form a sect, which still waited for the coming of the Messiah, or even acknowledged John as its Messiah (*see* Gieseler, *Kirchengeschichte* i. 69). This result, however, the Baptist had not anticipated, when continuing the exercise of his ministry. His sole and growing aim was to accelerate the triumph of Messiah's kingdom. Hence his denunciations of wickedness became more and more vehement. His denunciation of the adulterous connection between Herod Antipas and his brother Philip's wife led to his imprisonment. Like his prototype at Horeb, he could not understand or fall in with the Divine arrangement of events. In order to bring about an immediate and full manifestation of judgment and vengeance, the Baptist now despatched his embassy to Jesus (Matt. xi.), to induce the Messiah at once to reveal His power. Such being his views and motives, the scene at Horeb was once more enacted (1 Kings xix.). It was necessary that not only the contrast between the Old and the New Testament, but the spiritual superiority of Jesus, should be fully exhibited. It was not in his intellectual discernment, but through his feelings, that John erred in regard to Jesus: he was "offended" where, in analogous circumstances, Abraham, Moses, Elijah, Mary, and Peter stumbled. With divine gentleness, Jesus corrected his mistake; and this correction served at the same time as his vindication before the people. John is the greatest among the prophets of the Old Covenant; but the least in the kingdom of heaven—in the New Covenant—is greater than he in all that is distinctive of the New Testament, especially in clearness of faith and patience of suffering. Those who imagine that there is an inconsistency between John's testimony, John i. 36, and his message, Matt. xi. 3, apparently forget that this testimony was the utterance of his loftiest faith, while his subsequent embassy was that of his deepest temptation. Nor is there any ground for maintaining that the narrative of John and those of the synoptic Gospels differ in regard to the Baptist. That Christ considered the cause of John as identified with His own, and the Baptist himself as His forerunner and servant, appears from the fact, that He treated the iniquitous execution of John, which Antipas was induced to order, as an act of hostility against Himself and His kingdom (Matt. xiv. 13). For historical details, comp. the article in the Encyclops. *See* Joseph. *Antiq.* xviii. 5, 1 (also a monograph by Rohden, "*Johannes der Täufer,*" Lubeck, 1838).

Ver. 2. **The kingdom of heaven** (*of the heavens*, τῶν οὐρανῶν).—Viewing the kingdom of *God* in its entire historical extent and development, we mark in it two periods. In the first it appears in its typical form, as the Old Testament theocracy; in the second, as the kingdom of heaven, ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν. The contrast between the new manifestation, and the old form of the kingdom, had already been specified by Daniel (ch. ii. and ch. vii.). The use of the plural number in the original—*the kingdom of the heavens*, which also occurs in the Lord's Prayer—may be explained by the conception of seven heavens (comp. 2 Cor. xii. 2: "the third heaven"), but especially by the fact, that the kingdom of God extends, in its various spheres, throughout infinity. The kingdom of heaven, as appears from the prophecies of Daniel, is the kingdom of the Messiah; while the Lord's Prayer teaches us that it is the kingdom of God's Spirit, in which the will of man is made conformable to the will of God—a kingdom which comes from heaven, is heaven on earth, and ends in heaven. The expression is only found in Matthew (and in the rabbinical writings); but the same idea pervades the whole New Testament, where it frequently recurs under the designation of βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ, or βασιλ. τοῦ Χριστοῦ, or sometimes simply "the kingdom." Matthew no doubt chose the expression "kingdom *of heaven*," in order to distinguish the Christian kingdom of God more fully from the Jewish theocracy. (Monograph: Fleck, *De Regno Divino*, Lips. 1829.)

The contrast between the common Jewish expectations of the Messiah's kingdom (or the revelation of the Messiah with miraculous signs from heaven, resuscitation of the race of Abraham, war and victory over the Gentiles, subjugation of the Roman world to the Jews, a reign of a thousand years, etc.), and the kingdom of heaven in its true and spiritual manifestation, is already clearly indicated by the preaching of John. It has sometimes been said that the repentance inculcated by John was merely that of the Old, not that of the New, Testament. But, even granting this, we must remember that John cherished the spiritual views of repentance propounded by the prophets, and not the common legal notions of the Jews, and that he represented the Old Testament in its point of transition to the New. The Baptist evidently regarded repentance as a μετανοεῖν—a change of mind. He was aware of the difference between mere outward and real repentance—between transient feelings and that deep change which manifests itself by corresponding fruits of righteousness. His idea of repentance exceeded the outward requirements of the Mosaic law as much as his rite of immersion that of sprinkling. In his view, repentance implied an entire renunciation of the world—dying to the old, and consecration to a new life. Besides, it is important to bear in mind that the Baptist seems to have already, in some measure, realized the rejection of the unworthy portion of the race of Abraham, and the calling of the Gentiles. But the great point of distinction lies in this, that the repentance which he enforced must have sprung from faith in the predictions regarding the coming Messiah. The circumstance, that Josephus, in his notice of the Baptist (*Antiq.* xviii. 5, 2), omitted any allusion to John's testimony to the Messiah, is readily explained from his perfidious subserviency to Roman domination, which led him to renounce every hope dear to the Jewish heart and people.

Ver. 3. **For this is he that was spoken of by the prophet Isaiah**, Isa. xl. 3.—The quotation is made by the Evangelist, and not by the Baptist. In this case, also, we have the fulfilment of a typical, not a verbal prophecy. In its primary historical application, the passage (Isa. xl. 3, quoted from the Septuagint) contains a summons to prepare the way of Jehovah, who was about to bring back His people

from exile. There is an allusion to the well-known Oriental custom of preparing the way for princes in their travels (Wetstein *in loc.*). The summoning voice is that of a herald. The application of the passage by the Evangelist shows that, in his mind, the advent of Christ was that of Jehovah Himself, and the true deliverance of God's children from bondage; and that he regarded John as the real herald of the Lord. Many expositors of the original passage join the expression, ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, with ἑτοιμάσατε; but the Evangelist evidently connects it with βοῶντος, as John was actually in the wilderness. The sense would be the same in both cases, the object of the Evangelist being to give a symbolical import to the wilderness where the Baptist exercised his ministry.

What Isaiah uttered as a typical prophecy, became a distinct prediction in Malachi (iii. 1), who regarded the mission of the forerunner of the Lord as corresponding to that of Elijah, and hence assigned to him even the name of Elijah (iv. 5). It is not to be supposed that the prophet referred to two forerunners,—one heralding the Lord's coming to deliver His people, and merely resembling Elijah; the other, Elijah himself, come to make preparation for the day when Messiah should return to judge the earth. The prophet evidently regarded the day of judgment and the day of deliverance as the same. Similarly, the angel Gabriel also referred to John's ministry as a fulfilment of the prophecy regarding Elijah: "He shall turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers" (Mal. iv. 6, comp. Luke i. 17). Lastly, Christ Himself blended the two predictions of Malachi, and applied them to the Baptist (Matt. xi. 10, comp. ver. 14 and ch. xvii. 11). Among Jewish theologians, different views obtained about the return of one of the old prophets preparatory to the coming of Messiah (Berthold, *Christologie*, p. 58).

Ver. 4. **The same John had his raiment,** etc.—The expression implies that, as in the case of Elijah (2 Kings i. 8), the austere, ascetic appearance of the Baptist corresponded with the character of his preaching, being an emblem of renunciation of the world, and of repentance. (1.) *His* (peculiar and distinctive) dress was of camel's hair. Not of camel's skin, but of camel's hair, from which a coarse kind of cloth, used for clothing and for the covering of tents, was manufactured (see Meyer, p. 83). (2.) He had a leathern girdle. (3.) His food consisted of locusts, ἀκρίδες. "Several kinds of locusts were used for food, especially by the poorest of the people. Lev. xi. 22; comp. Plin. *Hist. Natur.* vi. 35; xi. 32, 35. This is still the case in the East, especially among the lower classes. After throwing away the wings and legs, they cover the body with salt, and eat it either boiled or fried. (Niebuhr, '*Reise*,' i. p. 402, etc.) The older expositors, under the impression that locusts were unfit for eating, conjectured that the original reading must have been, not ἀκρίδες, but ἐγκρίδες, *cakes*, or καρίδες, *shrimps*, or something else. But these conjectures do not deserve further consideration." *See* Meyer, p. 83. (4.) Wild honey was also part of his food. The question has been started, whether this honey was derived from trees or from bees? The latter flowed in abundance from clefts of rocks in the wilderness; the former was a kind of honey which issued from fig-trees, palms, and other trees. Meyer adopts the view of Suidas, that it was honey from trees; but surely it is needless to discuss whether the Baptist used one or both kinds of honey.

Ver. 5. **Then went out to him,** etc.—That is, to the banks of Jordan, הַיַּרְדֵּן (Gen. xiii. 10, 11; 1 Kings vii. 47; 2 Chron. iv. 17), from ירד to run or flow (as the German *Rhein* from *rinnen*). For a description of the scene, see Winer and other Encyclops. and geographical works, especially Robinson; comp. also a beautiful sketch of the quiet around the scene, in the Travels of Pastor Schulz of Mühlheim. Note particularly, that Jerusalem herself, the holy city, goes into the wilderness as a penitent,—the wilderness being considered, according to Old Testament notions, as an unclean locality, the habitation of demons (Lev. xvi. 21). A prelude this of Christ going forth to Golgotha, and of Christians going "beyond the camp," Heb. xiii. 13. Hence also Jerusalem is first mentioned, though in strict historical succession it would have been: the district about Jordan, Judæa, Jerusalem.

Ver. 6. **And were baptized,** immersed, in the Jordan, confessing their sins.—Immersion was the usual mode of baptism and the symbol of repentance. According to Meyer, repentance was symbolized by immersion, because every part of the body was purified. But, in that case, the whole body might have been washed without immersion. We must keep in view the idea of a symbolical descent into the grave, or the death of sin, although this view, as explained in Rom. vi., could not yet have been fully realized at the time (comp. *Leben Jesu* ii. 177. See also Ebrard, *Wissensch. Kritik* 257, who maintains that John fully understood the import of Christian baptism, and administered it accordingly). A full confession of sins accompanied the act of immersion. The compound ἐξομολογούμενοι denotes public confession. Hence it may perhaps be inferred that the confession was definite and specific,—the more so, as we might otherwise infer that a Jew would on such an occasion confess his special sins rather than his general sinfulness. The particular form of confession was, however, undoubtedly left to each individual.

Ver. 7. **But when he saw many of the Pharisees and Sadducees,** etc.—Circumstances now arose of a character to perplex the Baptist about the propriety of his administering baptism. When the Pharisees and Sadducees presented themselves, he might refuse to administer the sacred rite, for which their impenitence rendered them unfit; while, on the other hand, a baptism of repentance seemed inapplicable in the case of the Lord Jesus.

The Pharisees, Talm. פְּרוּשִׁין; according to Suidas, ἀφωρισμένοι, *separated, distinctively pious*, from פָּרַשׁ, to separate or divide,—not from the Particip. Act., "those who divide or make sharp distinctions" (teachers of the law), but from the passive or reflective form, in the sense of "separating themselves." They did not, however, constitute a sect, but a school or party, actuated by the most intense sectarianism. They were the living expression of outward, traditional, and legalistic Judaism; and their strict separation was in reference to Gentiles, Samaritans, publicans, and sinners. They prided themselves on the most rigid observance of those legal prohibitions and lustrations, prescribed in their traditions, which detracted so grievously from the spirituality of the law, and perverted its object. On their history, doctrines, and religious and political importance, see Josephus, *Antiq.* xiii. 5, 9; xiii. 10, 5, etc. Their true character can only be thoroughly gathered from the Gospels, from the narrative of our Lord's sufferings, from the Acts of the Apostles, and

the history of Ebionism. Compare the article on the subject in Winer [and other Encyclops.], and also the author's *Leben Jesu* ii. 1, p. 15, the *Gesch. des apostol. Zeitalters*, i. p. 296, [and works on Jewish History].

The Sadducees, Σαδδουκαῖοι (derived, according to Epiphanius, *Hæres.* i. 14, ἀπὸ δικαιοσύνης, *i. e.* from צַדִּיק, but, according to Jewish tradition, from a person called *Zadok*).—They were the party opposed to the Pharisees. On negative, antitraditional, foreign, and philosophical grounds, they rejected not only traditionalism, but also the inspired writings, except the books of Moses; and denied, along with the authority of the prophets, all the deeper truths of revelation, such as the immortality of the soul, and the resurrection, and its higher manifestations, such as the apparitions of angels. On all these points comp. Winer [and other Encyclops.], and the passages of Josephus relating to the subject, etc.

The third school or religious party of the Jews at this period, the *Essenes*, constituted a regular and fully organized sect. Comp. regarding them, Joseph. *De Bello Jud.* ii. 8; *Antiq.* xiii. 5, 9; and Philo's dissertation: *Quod omnis probus liber*. The Essenes (a name derived from ὅσιος, or חָסִיד, or better from אָסָא, to heal—hence *the healers*, θεραπευταί) did not submit to John's baptism. This is easily accounted for from the fact, that daily lustrations formed part of their ordinary religious observances. Hence they probably considered themselves as far beyond the baptism of John, which was only once administered, and, as a community, prepared to receive the Messiah. Lastly, from their blending of Alexandrian philosophy with Jewish notions of legal purifications, their views and expectations concerning the Messiah must have undergone considerable modification.

These three parties represented the three great deviations from the spirit and tendency of genuine Judaism. The Pharisees, like the Roman Catholics, exalted tradition into revelation, and superstitiously based their whole system on the principle of a righteousness procured by external observances. The Sadducees limited revelation to the law of Moses, and degraded the Mosaic faith into a rationalistic morality, a mere obedience of the law. The Essenes combined their Oriental and Alexandrian theosophy with revelation, excluded the idea of typical sacrifices, introduced dualistic doctrines, and based on it an esoteric righteousness peculiar to the members of their religious order. The Essenes formed a distinct sect; and, although the closest approximation in the synagogue to a deeper and more spiritual view of Judaism, and in some measure even anticipating the idea of a universal priesthood (as Ritschl has shown), they also adopted a greater admixture of views entirely heathen than any other school. Hence the idea of any connection between them and Christ, or even John, cannot for a moment be entertained (a statement, however, which does not apply to the later followers of John). By their lifeless orthodoxy, the Pharisees perverted Judaism itself into a sect; while the Sadducees formed an accommodating, negative, and sectarian party, who considered themselves, and acted chiefly as, a philosophic school.

The authority of John as a prophet, which, according to this passage, seems at first to have been recognised by a large portion of the dominant parties, and which probably occasioned the embassy, or at least private deputation, from the Sanhedrim, received a serious blow when John commenced his denunciations. The dislike thus engendered became strengthened and rooted when the scribes saw Him whom John announced as the Messiah of Israel,—one so entirely different from what they had expected; and lastly, when the Baptist promulgated views wholly opposed to those of the Pharisees on the question of divorce, and, consequently, fell a victim to the resentment of Herod and his wife. Accordingly, when afterwards challenged to give an opinion on the divine authority of John's baptism, the Pharisees declined to do so. Luke (vii. 30) refers to this subsequent attitude of the Pharisees and scribes in reference to the baptism of John.

It deserves notice, that Matthew does not repeat the article before Σαδδουκ.; "he includes them and the Pharisees in one and the same unworthy category."

Ver. 7. **When he saw them come** ἐπὶ τὸ βάπτισμα.—The meaning is not, *against the baptism*, as Olearius and some others would interpret the passage. The contrary is to be inferred from what follows: *who has warned you?* The expression does not, however, denote simply their coming *for the purpose of being baptized.* The Baptist regards them as unfit and improper candidates who presented themselves for baptism only to strengthen their self-righteous conceit. The suggestion of Meyer (p. 86), that, immediately on their arrival, they were deterred by John's denunciations from submitting to baptism, is equally unfounded. Such conduct would have placed them in open conflict with the Baptist; a course which even prudence forbade. But the effect of these denunciations was to diminish, and ultimately to stop, the crowds, belonging to their party, which had flocked to the scene of John's ministrations This explanation removes the imaginary contradiction, which some have pretended to discover, between the narrative of Matthew and that of Luke, Schneckenburger in favor of Luke, de Wette in favor of Matthew.

According to Luke iii. 7, these denunciations were addressed to the multitude (τοῖς ὄχλοις); according to Matthew, to the Pharisees and Sadducees. Their interest in and sanction of the movement, no doubt, attracted crowds to the place of baptism. The presence of a multitude thronging to submit to what, after all, was to them only an outward rite, ill accorded with the real aim of John, who was anxious not for a general profession, but for individual conversions.

O generation (brood) of vipers.—Γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν denotes persons at once deceitful and malicious. Isa. xiv. 29; lix. v.; Ps. lviii. 5. The expression would convey to an Israelite the idea of representatives of pernicious doctrines and principles,—instruments of the kingdom of darkness. Such were preëminently doomed to punishment. Gen. iii.; Matt. xiii. 41; 2 Thess. ii., etc.—**Who hath warned you?**—An indication of his distrust of the sincerity of their ostensible motives. It could only have been by a special miracle that you would have been directed hither by the Spirit of God.—**To flee.**—To flee, and thus to escape from, בָּרַח מִן. The infin. Aorist denotes their being already ostensibly in the act of fleeing.—**From the wrath to come,** ἀπὸ τῆς μελλούσης ὀργῆς.—The wrath, or the holy penal justice of God, is here identified with punishment itself. Rom. i. 18; Eph. ii. 3.

Ver. 8. **Bring forth, therefore.**—Οὖν, a conclusion relating partly to the charge brought against

them, and partly to their profession of repentance. **Fruits.**—Proper, suitable fruits. Comp. Matt. vii. 17 ff, also with special reference to the Pharisees. Such good fruit as could not be produced without an entire change in the fruit-tree itself.

Ver. 9. **And think not**—do not imagine you might **say within yourselves,**—*i. e.*, think; אָמַר בְּלִבּוֹ, to say in one's heart: Ps. iv. 5; x. 6; xiv. 1; Matt. ix. 21; Luke iii. 8; vii. 49.—**We have Abraham for our father;**—*i. e.*, we shall be saved, because, as descendants of Abraham, we are members of the theocracy, and partakers of the promise given to our father. This view is clearly propounded in later rabbinical writings. See Meyer, p. 87. Compare John viii. 39; Rom. ix. As to the genuine children of Abraham, see Rom. iv.—**God is able.**—God's almighty power and liberty are not limited by hereditary right. He may reject them as spurious children of Abraham; and, on the other hand, He is able to create out of the stones in the wilderness genuine children of Abraham by faith, *i. e.*, to transform uncultivated portions of the human race,—undoubtedly a reference to the calling of the Gentiles.

Ver. 10. **And now also the axe is laid,** etc.—The preceding sentence only implied that the punishment of the spurious descendants of Abraham was *possible;* that now under consideration asserts that it was not only possible, but near,—nay, that it had already begun. *Hence the use of the present tense.* Now already the axe lies at the root of the tree, ready for its work of destruction. The statement implies that they are unfruitful trees, or trees of a bad kind (ch. vii. 19). The punishment will equally descend on all; every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit, etc. This evidently refers to the exclusion of the unbelieving Jews from the kingdom of Messiah.

Ver. 11. **I indeed baptize you in (ἐν) water** (immersing you in the element of water) **unto repentance.**—The Baptist thus declares that he is not the judge, and, at the same time, that by his baptism of water he does not secure their salvation, but merely calls them to repentance. Lastly, he teaches them that his was merely a symbolical and temporary mission as the forerunner, to prepare for the higher mission of the Messiah. **He that cometh after me** (immediately following me), = *the Messiah.* The Baptist here describes his personal relation to the Messiah: **I am not worthy to bear His sandals,** to carry them and to take them away—in Mark and Luke, to tie on and to unloose. Among the Jews, Greeks, and Romans, this was the function of the meanest slaves. (See Wetstein, Rosenmüller, Jahn.)—He proceeds to point out the relation of his baptism to that of Christ. **He shall baptize,** or immerse, **you in the Holy Ghost and in fire.**—He will either entirely immerse you in the Holy Ghost as penitents, or, if impenitent, He will overwhelm you with the fire of judgment (and at last with hell-fire). This interpretation of the expression "*fire*" has been propounded by many of the Fathers (some of whom, however, referred it to the fire of purgatory); and among modern expositors, by Kuinoel, Schott, Neander [de Wette, Meyer]. But some commentators—among them Erasmus [Chrys., Calv., Beng., Olshaus., Ebrard, Ewald, Alford, Wordsworth]—apply the expression to the kindling, sanctifying fire of the Holy Ghost. The warning tone of the passage, and the expression **unquenchable** fire, in ver. 12, are against this interpretation.* In some Codd. the words καὶ πυρὶ are omitted, probably from the erroneous supposition that they were equivalent to Holy Ghost.

Ver. 12. **Whose fan.**—Here we have another figure of judgment, showing, even in a more striking manner than the preceding, the necessity and propriety of such judgment. The theocracy is the husbandry of God. But if the wise husbandman removes from his garden all such trees as merely encumber the ground, much more will he in harvest-time separate on the threshing-floor the wheat from the chaff, and deal with each according to the rules of husbandry. But the theocracy, or the kingdom of God, is with great propriety represented as God's special field, of which both the sowing and the harvest are His (Matt. xiii. 3). The fan in His hand, or the instrument for the separating or purging, is the word, or the preaching of the Gospel.—**Threshing-floor,** ἅλων, גֹּרֶן—a circular space, beaten down or paved, on the farm. The corn was either trodden by oxen [or horses], or crushed by means of a threshing, sledge drawn by oxen [or horses]. Robinson, ii. 306. The threshing-floor denotes Messiah's sphere of action (Ewald),—the holy land in an ideal rather than a material and literal sense (Meyer); not mankind (Baumgarten-Crusius), or the Jewish people (de Wette). The extent of this threshing-floor necessarily increases from century to century. The starting-point was the land of Judæa; the farthest verge is the earth's remotest boundary,—being then ground beaten for threshing, and no longer a field which requires to be sowed. The *purging* of the threshing-floor is effected by separating the wheat and the chaff of the sheaves collected on it. He will διακαθαρίζειν, *i.e.*, thoroughly purge.—**The Wheat.**—True and penitent believers, the precious, pure produce of God's husbandry.—**The garner,** ἀποθήκη, the granary; usually dry, subterranean vaults. An emblem, first, of the kingdom of heaven on earth; and, secondly, of the heavenly inheritance.—**The chaff.**—In the widest sense, whatever is crushed, cut small. Here it means the whole refuse of God's husbandry: First, the agencies applied to bring out the wheat; and, secondly, the persons whose hearts have clung to these agencies alone, and who, by their vain, formal services, have themselves become chaff. Whatever is to be assigned to the fire, the judgment-fire (Mal. iv. 1), hell-fire (Matt. xxv. 41), is chaff. Chaff was used for fuel.—The expression, **unquenchable fire** (see Isa. lxvi. 24), points beyond the figure to the reality, although it denotes, in the first place, the violent, uncontrollable blaze of a straw fire. When the fiery judgment begins, it continues without interruption, till the unquenchable fire of Gehenna is kindled.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The almost simultaneous appearance of two such personages as John and Jesus indicated that this was a unique period of extraordinary commotion in the history of the world. John the Baptist was the personal embodiment of the Old, Christ that of the New, Testament; and as John was the forerunner of Christ, it follows that the Old Testament was the forerunner of Christ in respect of the inward and spiritual obedience and righteousness which it demanded. This spiritual legalism John represented, just as the Virgin was the representative of the pro-

* [Not necessarily so. It is harsh to separate "the Holy Spirit" and "fire," as referring to opposite classes of persons, when they are clearly united in ὑμᾶς, and by the copulative καί (not the disjunctive ἤ, *aut*). Moreover this prophecy was literally fulfilled on the day of Pentecost, when the Holy Spirit descended upon the disciples in tongues of fire, Acts ii. 3.—P. S.]

phetic hope and the evangelical aspirations of the Old Testament. Hence, Mary brings the Lord to the people; John brings the people to the Lord. But both were merely the means for introducing the New Testament and the Lord: He Himself is the new and perfect revelation of the divine, theanthropic, and redeeming life.—The contrast between John, the rigid preacher of repentance, and Jesus, the gentle preacher of the kingdom of heaven, had already been typified among the ancient prophets by the similar contrast between Elijah and Elisha. Elijah, for the most part, performed miracles of vengeance and judgment, pointing forward to the final catastrophe, the fiery judgment, and the end of the world. Hence he was appropriately snatched from the world in a fiery chariot. On the other hand, Elisha performed, for the most part, miracles of mercy and deliverance, thus preparing the way for the Messianic prophets. This contrast in the typical missions of Elijah and Elisha was itself an emblem, which had its entire fulfilment in the great contrast between Old and New Testament times, as exhibited in the twofold advent of the Baptist and of Christ.

2. The Old Testament contains the most varied references to the New, by its promises, its law, its types, and its prophecies. Its most striking reference, however, is that with which it closed, presenting as it did, in the person of the Baptist, the most faithful embodiment of the old dispensation. Thus the relation of the Baptist to Christ was that of the Old Testament itself to the Saviour. The grand mission of John was the baptism unto repentance. Its elements and commencement existed in the Old Testament; but the ordinance itself can only be understood if viewed as a new act of Divine revelation, a Divine mission, a prophetic creation. Its real import appears from the declaration that the whole people of Israel were utterly unclean. Once of old they walked over the dried bed of Jordan: now they must be immersed in the current of Jordan in their old state, in order to come out of it thoroughly renewed. But this declaration of the Baptist implied also the idea, that mere legal lustrations were incapable of purifying the people,—a truth which was also conveyed to their minds by the solemnities of the great day of atonement (Lev. xvi.). Lastly, all this indicated that the baptism unto repentance was itself only a symbol, being an outward expression of the fact, that legal institutions were incapable of delivering the Jewish nation from sin. Accordingly, the baptism of John was at the same time a baptism unto repentance and in preparation for the coming of the Messiah, and its last and highest aim was to point the people to the person of the Messiah.

3. That John appeared in the wilderness as a preacher of repentance, and there administered his rite of purification, is another evidence of the great change which the views of Israel were about to undergo. According to Old Testament ideas, the camp would be considered clean, and the wilderness unclean (Lev. xvi.). This, however, is now reversed; and Jerusalem must go forth to the wilderness, there to seek her purification. Typically, this contrast points forward to Golgotha, to the accursed place without the city, and to the Church of Christ disowned and excommunicated by the synagogue. But it also points backward to the voice of him who cried in the wilderness. Isa. xl. 3 (comp. John i. 23). Again, the wilderness is a symbol of the nation itself, or at least of the state of the Jews at the time. In that wilderness the prophet can find no path for the advent of the Lord. Hence a way has now to be prepared for Him by repentance; and this forms the burden of his message. Such was the grand mission of John: his work and commission was mainly, if not exclusively, to call to repentance. Besides the symbolic character attaching from its nature to a wilderness, the sojourn of John in the desert pointed to those deeper experiences, resulting from contemplation, retirement, and constant prayer, which marked the spiritual development of genuine Judaism even at an earlier period (Moses, Elijah, John, Christ, the Anchorites).

4. The expression, "*Repent ye*," is not equivalent with "*Do penance*." * The original means, *Change your minds*, your mode of thinking and of viewing things,—not *in order* that the kingdom of heaven may come, but *because* it is coming or approaching (**for the kingdom of heaven is at hand**). This change of mind could only spring from a sense of the free mercy of God in manifesting the kingdom of heaven, and from the revelation of Christ in His grace and truth. Nor can it ever be otherwise; for without repentance, change of mind, conversion, regeneration (John iii.), it is impossible to enter the kingdom of heaven.

5. We have already indicated the peculiar meaning attaching to the expression, *kingdom of God*, as distinguished from the *kingdom of heaven*. The former is the general conception and includes the entire kingdom of God, in every sense and bearing. Thus the theocracy was the kingdom of God in its typical and Old Testament form; while the kingdom of Christ is the kingdom of heaven, or the kingdom of God in its reality, or the real theocracy. Viewed as a whole, the kingdom of God is the higher manifestation of the universal supremacy and rule of God in nature and in history, and the preparation for the kingdom of glory (kingdom of *power*, kingdom of *grace*, kingdom of *glory*). In direct contrast to the kingdom of grace is that of darkness. It appears along with the kingdom of grace, and keeps pace with it; and, though appearing to conquer, ultimately is always conquered. At last, when the kingdom of God shall have been perfected, it will also have reached its full and final development, and be ripe for the self-annihilation which awaits it. Then shall it also appear that all along it had been entirely subject to the kingdom of omnipotence, and subservient to the advancement of the kingdom of glory. In New Testament times, the Christian Church and the Christian State may be regarded as the twofold *manifestation* of the kingdom of God; which, however, must not be confounded with the *essence* of the kingdom of God. Lastly, the kingdom of God is the kingdom of heaven, both in respect of its origin and its goal, its essence and its manifestation, its King and its people, its law and its citizenship—the royal dominion of God in the souls of believers, through Christ and his Holy Spirit.

6. We may view the asceticism and austerity of John under a twofold aspect. On the one hand, it marks him out as a perfect Nazarite. The institution of Nazarites, with its various prohibitions, was from the first intended as something similar to, nay,

* ["*Do penance*," is the Roman Catholic version, made at Rhelms, A. D. 1582. It follows closely here, as elsewhere, the Latin Vulgate which renders the Greek μετανοεῖτε, Matt. iii. 2, etc.: *Poenitentiam agete*. This difference of translation affects materially the whole conception of repentance. Luther translates: "*Thut Busse;*" but there is a difference between *Busse*, *repentance*, and *Büssung*, *penance*.—P. S.]

as a higher completion of, the legal priesthood (*Leben Jesu*, i. 63; *apost. Zeitalter*, ii. 303 and 398*). Hence the circumstance, that both John and the Apostle James were Nazarites, may be regarded as forming an appropriate transition from the Old Testament priesthood to that of the Spirit under the New Testament, just as the synagogue was a transition from the temple to the church. In other words, the Nazarites were the connecting link between the Old and New Testament priests, just as the synagogue was between the temple, the church, and the washing with water, between circumcision and baptism, and the breaking of bread and the cup of thanksgiving, between the passover and the Lord's Supper. It was necessary that John should occupy the position of a Nazarite in order to pronounce sentence of impurity, not only upon the Jewish people, but upon their priesthood. Nor was his profession merely symbolical, implying a symbolical renunciation of the world. He actually renounced the pomp, the luxury, and the pursuits of his age and nation, and appeared before his cotemporaries free to utter his solemn denunciations against Pharisees and Sadducees, against the rulers of the synagogue and the rulers of the people.

7. It is most important to note the contrast between the grounds on which John was unwilling to baptize the Pharisees and Sadducees, and those on which he shrunk from baptizing the Lord. In his judgment, the former did not come up to the law of the Old Testament, while Jesus went far beyond the Old Testament. The Pharisees were unfit for baptism; baptism was unfit for the Lord Jesus. The rulers of his people appear in the presence of the Baptist as "children," or rather as a race degenerate, and alien to true Judaism; while before Christ the Baptist lowly bends as the humblest servant in presence of the most glorious Lord. How different, then, the picture here presented of the spirit of the Old Testament from that drawn by some, who would identify the religion of the Old Covenant with pharisaical Judaism!

8. The circumstance, that the Baptist is here introduced as denouncing sinners, sufficiently accounts for the difference between his delineation of the advent of Christ as the Judge, in the passage before us, and his description of Christ as the suffering Saviour in His address to His disciples, John i. Besides, throughout the Old Testament, and indeed throughout Scripture, judgment and salvation are closely connected; and it has been too much the practice of scholastic theologians to sever and disjoin these two ideas. Further, the picture presented to the mind of the Baptist was evidently that of the advent of Christ, in all its phases to its final manifestation, commencing with the first, and including the second appearance of the Saviour. The judgment of separation, which was to be completed at His second advent, commenced at the first. The "fruits meet unto repentance," which the Baptist required, were evidence of a genuine religious and moral renovation and regeneration, which implied the opposite of mere externalism and feigned repentance.

9. The baptism of *water*, and the baptism of *fire*,—the one administered by John, the other by Christ; the one bearing reference to the advent of the Messiah, the other, to the Messiah Himself, who had already appeared; the one, unto repentance in the sense of renouncing and dying unto the world, the other, unto repentance in the sense of the death and resurrection of Christ; the one, with water, which can only purify externally (legally and symbolically), the other, with the Holy Ghost, whose fire purifies internally, and purges away all dross; the one, to a forgiveness of sins which as yet was only matter of hope, and was to be really obtained in the baptism of the Spirit; the other, as the seal of actual forgiveness of sins. The baptism of John contained only the germ of a sacrament in the peace of hope which it conveyed, and the conditional assurance of a future baptism of the Spirit or reception into the kingdom of the Messiah; while Christ's baptism of the Spirit finds its appropriate expression in the sacrament of Christian Baptism as the sign and seal of the inward baptism of the Spirit. It is indeed true that the baptism of the Saviour by John constitutes both the origin and the basis of Christian baptism; but it were to detract from the full meaning of that sacrament to assimilate it with the baptism of John, instead of viewing the latter as gradually advancing from the baptism of disciples to the baptism of Christ. Christian baptism, on the other hand, in the same proportion in which it degenerates in the church, relapses into the baptism of John, *i. e.*, it approaches to the character of mere water-baptism. But whatever way we regard it, this great difference remains, that while the disciples of John still waited for the formation of the Church, we behold it in all its beauty, and with all its blessings of forgiveness and of peace. In other words, in the one case, the full idea of baptism, in its objective import as a sacrament, is realized,—the only requirement being, that he who receives the ordinance receive it in spirit and in faith; while, in the other, the objective aspect of baptism—or the Church—was still awanting. Hence the baptism of John might be repeated; not so Christian baptism. The baptism of John was not complete: in it the full idea of the rite was not exhausted;* while we, who are baptized into the death of Christ, can fully enter into its meaning.

10. The transcendent majesty of the Lord appears, as He stands side by side with the Baptist, the greatest among them born of women under the Old Covenant. But the greatness of John consisted mainly in his almost unexampled humility, which from the first led him to designate his work which shook Israel to its centre as merely preparatory, and to subordinate himself at once to Him who was far greater than he.

11. The baptism of fire—in the sense of its purifying efficacy—had been already predicted by Malachi (iii. 3). Hence we conclude that the baptism of John must have conveyed at least some of the effects of this purifying fire. In another respect, also, there is a close connection between John and Malachi, as the denunciations of the Baptist were only a further development and application of the great truths propounded by the prophet about the insufficiency of the old theocracy; and just as Malachi pointed to the Baptist, so the Baptist points to Christ. Although the awakening produced by John, as every legal awakening, was not of a lasting character, its effects were permanent in the hearts of the elect, and more

* [The original substitutes here a (—) for a (,). I looked at the work quoted and rectified the reference.—P. S.]

* [Dr. Lange: "Die *Taufe* des Johannes ging noch nicht in die volle *Tiefe;*"—a play on words with reference to the etymology of *Taufe* from *teufen, tiefen*, i. e., *to plunge into the deep, to submerge*. With the same reference Dr. Lange calls Christian baptism "die absolute *Vertiefung*," which is equivalent in meaning to the apostle's figure of burial with Christ: "Therefore we are buried with Him by baptism into death," Rom. vi. 4.—P. S.]

especially among his own disciples. This was sufficient—the Lord found a soil ready and prepared.

12. The most marvellous evidence of the spiritual power wielded by John was, that he induced the self-righteous and hypocritical professors of his age to submit to a baptism unto repentance, and that in such numbers, that it became a kind of agreeable fashion to go into the wilderness to be baptized (John v. 35).

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

John and Christ; or the Founder of the New Covenant accredited by the last prophet of the Old Covenant.—John a connecting link between Malachi and Christ.—Old Testament prophecy pointing to Christ in the Baptist.—The baptism of John in its import, 1. as a token from God; 2. as concluding the Old Dispensation; 3. as a prophecy of the baptism of Christ.—As the renunciation of the world initiated by the Baptist only reached its completion in the death of Christ on the cross, so the baptism of John in that of Christ.—Baptism implies a descent into the depths,* 1. of self-knowledge; 2. of repentance; 3. of renunciation of the world; 4. of self-surrender to the grace of the Lord.—The call of the Old and New Testaments, *Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand*: 1. The agreement between John and Christ in this call; 2. the difference in their meaning and application; 3. the call of John fully understood and completed in that of Christ.—The eternal basis and fundamental idea of all preaching—repentance and faith.—Baptism and preaching always go together.—John the prototype of preachers of repentance, as the voice of one crying in the wilderness: 1. The whole man, in all his saying and doing, a voice; 2. only a voice; 3. a voice crying; 4. a voice sounding through the wilderness, and awakening it.—Consistency of practice and teaching as giving point to our preaching—which is the voice of the Spirit in the world, *Prepare ye the way of the Lord*. 1. How it sounds: *a*. It sounds from every direction; *b*. in every place; *c*. at every hour; *d*. for every heart. 2. What the voice requires: *a*. A way for the Lord; *b*. to prepare the way for the Lord; *c*. to prepare it in the wilderness.—The way of the Lord is prepared by making a plain path. 1. The heart which was lifted up must be abased by repentance. 2. The heart that was abased must be lifted up by faith. 3. The heart which was wavering must have a straight path marked out by spiritual decision of life.—The outward renunciation of the world by the Baptist an emblem of that inward renunciation which every one has solemnly vowed in baptism.—Spiritual life is that state in which we freely renounce all things.—Wonderful effect upon the world of a believing renunciation of the world.—When judgment is at hand, our safety lies in being ready to part with all things.—Times of awakening are times of budding. 1. Their presence marks a spring-time from on high; 2. the blossoms must decay; 3. many blossoms are empty and fruitless; but, 4. some lasting fruit also remains.—The baptism of John the last festive hour of the Old Covenant.—Legal repentance must be followed up by evangelical repentance; *i. e.*, sorrow for sin, caused by fear, must be followed by sorrow for sin, caused by love.—Genuine confession of sin marking spiritual decision and action.—Genuine confession of sin the foundation of every confession of faith.—Christ submitted to the baptism of John, although even Pharisees and Sadducees had received the rite.—The Pharisees and the Sadducees applying for baptism, or professing penitence. 1. Both parties were equally hypocritical. 2. They differed in the peculiar form of their hypocrisy. 3. They were equally overwhelmed by the judgment which descends on all hypocrites.—The self-righteousness of religious formalism always produces a generation of vipers hypocritically conforming to its demands: 1. A low and unimpressible generation; 2. a cunning; 3. a malicious and dangerous, generation.—The genuineness of our repentance must be proved by good fruits.—Our spiritual state must be brought to the test of everyday duty, or, Christian virtue must imply and perfect natural virtue.—There are in every age those who appeal to their descent from Abraham. Such appeal has, 1. always the same meaning; is, 2. different in different ages; and yet, 3. in every age equally vain and pernicious.—"God is able from these stones to raise up children to Abraham;" or, the creative power of free grace: 1. It can create children of Abraham from the stones of the wilderness (the hard hearts of the heathen),—for a stone has manifestly no life. 2. Such a change may be expected rather than in those who hypocritically profess to be Abraham's children; for empty profession *simulates* life.—The Lord as Judge, under the figure of a husbandman: 1. among His trees; 2. on His threshing-floor.—"*The axe is laid to the root of the trees*:" 1. Its meaning: judgment has already commenced; there is no time to be lost. 2. Its application: be changed into good trees; bring forth fruits of righteousness; there is still time for it.—The majesty of Christ, as manifest in the contrast between John and Christ.—The baptism of water and the baptism of the Spirit; the baptism of the Spirit and the baptism of fire.—The baptism of the Spirit is itself a baptism of fire.—The grand final harvest in history; or, judgment and salvation. 1. The fan on the threshing-floor; or, the word of God separating the two classes. 2. The gathering of the wheat into the kingdom of love; or, the complete salvation of God's people. 3. The chaff in unquenchable fire; or, the judgment of hypocrites.—The burning chaff, or the judgment: 1. As consuming all those outward forms, whether secular or spiritual, which had served as the vehicle of life; 2. as fiery torments of mere professors of religion, who sought for life in those forms alone,—*a*. throughout the course of history,—*b*. at the end of the world.—All empty profession as continually self-destroying and self-consuming—a hell: 1. an emblem of hell; 2. that which really constitutes hell; 3. the final object of hell.—The judgment of the world is at the same time the completion of the kingdom of God and of His children.

Starke:—The sum and substance of all Divine teaching is, repentance and faith.—He that would enter into the kingdom of heaven must, with heart and soul, forsake the kingdom of the world.—Wherever Christ goes with His Gospel, He finds nothing but a wilderness.—The law must rouse the conscience and open the door for the Gospel.—Teachers of religion must neither be flatterers, nor self-seekers, nor servants of men.—A Christian is satisfied with such provision as he can get. Let a minister be content even though he be placed in a wilderness.—Worldly men tremble, indeed, in view of judgment and of wrath; but although they dissemble and humble themselves, they are not sincere in Christ.—It is quite possible to combine a holy zeal with

* ["Die *Taufe* geht mit uns in die *Tiefe*."—Comp. the preceding note.—P. S.]

genuine love.—Preachers should be acquainted with the prejudices of men.—**We become Christians, not by birth, but by regeneration.**—Outward communion with the Church will only ensure heavier judgment to those who enjoy it without becoming true believers.—The less merit a minister claims for himself in the work of his Master, the more successful will he be.—Holiness and humility advance at equal pace.—A preacher must know both how to allure and how to arouse his hearers.

Gerlach:—The tree which is unfit for bearing good fruit is fit at last for firewood. The man who will not be a monument of saving grace shall show forth the justice and holiness of God.

Heubner:—To become a preacher in the wilderness, requires moral heroism.—The doors of the heart must be thrown wide open if the King of glory is to enter in.—The confession of sinners (of sins) is of incalculable value.—"Generation of vipers:" there is frequently much of the serpent about the human heart, both in its malice and inclination towards falsehood and deception.—The plainness and unsparing severity of John is far preferable to weak gentleness; the former rouses and excites just apprehension, while the latter lulls asleep and causes false security.—The false confidence of the Jews and their ancestors a warning to all.—National pride.—Only that which is good and pure can be admitted into the kingdom of Christ: all that is impure will be cast out.

B. Chapter III. 13–17.

(Second Pericope on Sunday after the Feast of Circumcision or New Year.)

Contents.—He who baptizes with the Spirit, and with fire, humbles Himself to submit to the baptism of water, administered to a sinful community. From this communion with sinners the Father exalts Him into communion with the blessed Trinity. The Baptist points Him out to the people as the Messiah promised to the fathers.

13 Then cometh Jesus from Galilee to [the] Jordan unto John, to be baptized of [by]
14 him. But John forbade him, saying, I have need to be baptized of [by] thee, and
15 comest thou to me? And Jesus answering said unto him, Suffer it *to be so*[1] now: for
16 thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness. Then he suffered him. And Jesus,
when he was baptized, went up straightway out of [from] the water: and, lo, the
heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove,
17 and lighting [coming] upon him: And, lo, a voice from heaven, saying, This is my
beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.

[1] Ver. 15.—[The words *to be so*, are unnecessary. *Suffer it now*, is sufficient for ἄφες ἄρτι.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 13. **Then** (τότε).—In contrast with the baptism of the Pharisees and Sadducees, we have here the baptism of Jesus. At that time Jesus came from Galilee to Jordan, to be baptized of him. Meyer suggests the following as the object of Christ's baptism (p. 91):—"Jesus did not come to be baptized from a feeling of personal sinfulness (Bruno Bauer, comp. Strauss); nor because, according to the Levitical law, His personal connection with an impure people rendered Him impure (Lange); nor for the purpose of showing that there was no incompatibility between His σὰρξ ἀσθενείας and life in the Spirit (Hoffmann, *Weissagung und Erfüllung*, vol. ii. 82); nor because baptism implied a declaration of being subject to the penalty of death (Ebrard); nor in order to elicit the Divine declaration that He was the Messiah (Paulus); nor to confirm the faith of His followers, inasmuch as baptism was a symbol of the regeneration of His disciples (Ammon, L. J. vol i. 268); nor to sanction the baptism of John by His example (Kuinoel, Kern); nor to indicate His obligation to obey the law (Hoffmann, Krabbe, Osiander); nor, lastly, because, before the descent of the Spirit, He acted like any other ordinary Israelite (Hess, Kuhn, comp. Olshausen). The true explanation of this act, as furnished in ver. 15, is, that, as the Messiah, He felt that, according to the Divine will, He had to submit to the baptism of His forerunner in order to receive the Divine declaration of His Messianic dignity (vers. 16, 17). It was not in baptism that He first became conscious of His dignity as the Messiah, as if by that act He had been inwardly transformed into the Messiah; the expression, πρέπον ἐστὶν ἡμῖν (ver. 15), implies that He was conscious of being the Messiah, and of the relation in which, as such, John stood towards Him."—We thankfully admit the value of the comprehensive summary furnished by Meyer of the various views propounded on the subject of Christ's baptism. But his own explanation does not make it any clearer, either on what grounds Jesus submitted to a baptism unto *repentance*, or in what sense we are to understand the words of the Saviour, "*Thus it becomes us to fulfil all righteousness*,"—an expression which must evidently refer to Old Testament righteousness. With this remark we return to our own explanation. In strict application of the law of Moses as expounded by Haggai (ii. 14), John had pronounced the whole people of Israel impure. Jesus Himself, although sinless and holy, was included in this general declaration; His connection with His people rendering Him levitically unclean. This implied that, from His connection with the people, He must needs suffer, or that He, being innocent, must suffer for the people. And thus he fulfilled all righteousness. Meyer is, of course, right in suggesting, that when the Saviour thus freely yet obediently submitted Himself to the judgment resting upon His people, He was preparing for His own glory, and hence, also, for "the declaration of His Messianic dignity." But this formed the second or last element in the baptism of Christ, not its basis or fundamental idea. It is scarcely necessary to add, that our explanation includes that of Ebrard; only that, in our view, the

idea of consecration unto death was not yet fully expressed in the baptism of John, which only implied sufferings similar to death.

Ver. 14. **But John forbade Him** [sought to hinder him].—According to Strauss and de Wette, this passage is inconsistent with the statement in John i. 23, "*I knew Him not.*" But this passage refers only to the *prophetic* or *divine* certitude of the Baptist concerning the Messiahship of Jesus. Such certitude could neither be the result of what his mother Elisabeth would tell him, nor of his previous acquaintanceship with Jesus: it could only be obtained by a distinct sign from on high. Still he was sufficiently impressed with the religious and moral exaltation of Jesus to feel that He required not baptism at His hands (Hoffmann). Add to this the wonderful impression produced by the personal appearance of the Lord, and by the increasing conviction of John that what his parents had formerly told him would now prove to be true. Accordingly, he felt as the less in presence of the greater—as a sinner in presence of the Holy One. The obvious inference from the baptism which He administered, and to which Jesus was about to submit, seemed so strange to the Baptist, that he shrunk from it. Hence the expression **he forbade Him**, διεκώλυεν—the composite being stronger than the simple verb. Jesus removed these objections by simply referring to the requirements of righteousness; by which our Lord must have meant the Levitical consequences of John's prophetic mission, and not that John would see what miraculous sign should accompany the rite. The great object was simple obedience. How to own and glorify the obedience of His dear Son, God reserved to Himself. Any confession of sin was, of course, out of the question: there was only a profession on the part of Jesus, that as an Israelite He became subject to the law, and that He was connected with humanity by the ties of blood, of history, of suffering, and of love. The apocryphal *Prædicatio Pauli* (see Credner, *Beiträge* i. p. 360) first set forth the false notion that Jesus made a confession of sin; while in the *Evang. sec. Hebr.* (see Hieronymus, *Contr. Pel.* iii. 2), Jesus replies to the solicitations of His mother and brethren to be baptized along with them: "*Quid peccavi, ut vadam et baptizer ab eo? nisi forte hoc ipsum quod dixi, ignorantia est.*" On the discussion between John and Jesus in the *Evang. sec. Hebr.*, see Meyer, p. 92.

Ver. 15. **Thus it becomes us.**—The baptism of Jesus was a duty, not only on the part of the Lord, but also on the part of the Baptist.

Ver. 16. **Went up straightway.**—A special meaning attaches to the word εὐθύς, as if He had flown upwards from out of the water. This miraculous ascent from the deep was connected with the equally miraculous descent of the Spirit of God from on high.

Lo, the heavens were opened unto Him; ἀνεῴχθησαν.—The contradictory [rationalistic] explanations of Paulus, who speaks of a *clearing up* of the sky, and of Kuinoel and Ammon, who speak of a *thunder-storm*, may neutralize each other. Meyer maintains that it must not be considered as a poetic description of what took place, but that the heavens were *literally opened*, and the Holy Spirit descended through this opening. It is difficult to understand the exact meaning of Meyer, as this view implies that the event itself was mythical, and hence also poetical. In another place (*Leben Jesu*, ii. 1, p. 183), we have ventured to suggest that even the outward phenomena attending this great event were unique, the stars making their appearance on the occasion. In this way it would seem to bear analogy with the darkening of the sun at midday during the crucifixion, even as Christ's baptism was analogous, and formed a prelude to, His final sufferings. But there was also undoubtedly a vision, in which, although mainly designed for the Saviour, the Baptist had also a part (comp. John xii. 28; Acts ix. 7; xxii. 9). For the Baptist must evidently have heard the voice by which Jesus was designated as the "*beloved Son.*" Although the word εἶδε refers primarily to Jesus Himself, we conclude that John also participated in the vision,—1. from his having heard the voice; 2. from the account given by Luke and by John. Thus, while the vision was primarily designed for Christ, it must have been beheld by both.

Like a dove (Luke: σωματικῷ εἴδει ὡσεὶ περιστεράν).—The expression cannot be meant as symbolical simply of the manner in which the Spirit descended—*rapid* (Fritzsche), *quiet* (Neander), *pure* (Olshausen), *creative* (Baumgarten-Crusius). Meyer very appropriately calls attention to the parallel passage in Luke; nor must we lose sight of the import of the term εἶδε. The Gospel of the Hebrews, as quoted by Epiph. xxx. 13, correctly interprets the phrase as implying that he saw the Holy Spirit of God descending in the form (or rather in the visionary form, εἴδει) of a dove. It was not a real dove; but, to his vision, it appeared as the form of a dove descending. A symbol this of perfect gentleness, purity, fulness of life, and of the power of communicating it.

Ver. 17. **And lo a voice.**—Comp. Luke v. 12; xix. 20; Acts viii. 27; Rev. iv. 1; vi. 2; vii. 9. Along with the Holy Spirit, the Father and the Son also now manifest themselves. The term **Son** is applied to the Messiah (Ps. ii. 7; Isa. xlii. 1), not merely in reference to His official character, but more especially to His Divine nature. There is evidently an allusion here to the miraculous origin of Christ by the Holy Ghost (Matt. i. 20; Luke i. 35). The expression, ὁ ἀγαπητός, is neither equivalent to our "*most beloved*" (in the superlative degree), nor to "*only one,*" but means "**only beloved**" or *beloved* in a *unique* sense.—Ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα, **In whom I am well pleased.**—The verb is put in the Aorist to denote the eternal act of loving contemplation with which the Father regards the Son. There is a rhythmical connection between this event, the testimony to the Son heard in the temple, and, lastly, the voice from heaven heard on the Mount of Transfiguration. Nor must we omit noticing the peculiar demonstrative form of the expression, in Matthew, "**This is My beloved Son,**" not, "*Thou art My Son:*" implying, 1. that this voice was specially designed as a revelation to John; 2. that it was granted to him for the purpose of his mission, which was to introduce Jesus as the Messiah to the people. In the Gospels of Mark and Luke, there is a more particular reference to Jesus Himself as the source and spring of the vision, "*Thou art My beloved Son;*" while John lays special stress upon the part which the Baptist sustained in the vision.

General Notes on the Whole Section.—The objections raised by modern criticism against the *historical* character of this narrative fall to the ground the moment we acknowledge the supernatural element in the life of our Saviour. We cannot even admit with Meyer, that there is a real difference between the account as given

by John and the other Evangelists; far less can we agree with him in reducing the fact in the case to the vision of a dove. The fact, that this was a vision, does not exclude the objective reality of this miraculous event; on the contrary, it is in perfect accordance with it. The question, whether before that time the dove was regarded as a symbol of the Holy Spirit, is one of considerable interest. Among the Syrians, the dove was held sacred, as the symbol of the fructifying power of nature (Creuzer, *Symbolik*, ii. 80). This throws fresh light upon the expression in Gen. i. 2, that "the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters:" the Talmud has it, that He moved over it *like a dove*. But the symbol is not further carried out in the Old Testament, though there is much significance in the dove of Noah's ark, and the dove in the Song of Solomon. Our Lord also alludes to it in Matt. x. 16. Taking a general survey of these emblems, we gather the impression, that the symbol of a dove referred more particularly *to the Church*, as indeed the Holy Spirit manifests Himself and, so to speak, assumes shape in the Church. On the Talmudical and rabbinical interpretations of this symbol, comp. Meyer, p. 98.

According to Strauss, the statement of the Evangelist, that "Christ was conceived by the power of the Holy Ghost," cannot be reconciled with the narrative in the text, that at His baptism He was baptized with the Holy Ghost. Critics of his school have attempted to connect this baptism with the Holy Ghost, with the view of some of the Gnostics (Cerinthus, Basilides, Valentinus, etc.), that the man Jesus received at His baptism the heavenly Logos. But all these assertions ignore the truth of the human development of our Lord. At His *birth*, He was filled and actuated by the Holy Spirit, *so far as His talent and disposition was concerned*. This implied His perfect sinlessness. But at His baptism, He attained the *full consciousness of His nature and mission as the God-Man and Saviour*. From that moment He became the organ of the Holy Spirit, not merely so far as He was personally concerned, but also as fully realizing His mediatorial character and work, and its relation to the salvation of mankind. He now received the Holy Ghost in His capacity as founder of the spiritual community about to be instituted. But this fulness of the Spirit remained still concealed under the form of a servant, and in the lowliness of His walk and work. It was only after the work had been finished and accepted, that the Spirit was poured out in all His fulness upon His believing people; and the dove, which had erst descended into His heart, now issued forth to move and to brood over the waters of the nations of the earth.

In the passive baptism of Jesus (that by John), we have the first glimmer of a distinct revelation of the mystery of the *Holy Trinity*. It brightens into full glory at the active baptism of Jesus, or the institution of Holy Baptism in Matt. xxviii., which is in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.—The connection between the two events is manifest.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. Jesus cometh from Galilee to the lower Jordan unto John, to be baptized of him. From this we draw the following inferences: 1. The influence of the baptism of John had extended over the whole people of Israel. 2. Jesus came under the direct and irresistible impulse of the Holy Spirit. This was His first act after attaining manhood, since the time when, at twelve years of age, He manifested Himself in the temple, and again retired to the obscurity of Nazareth. Yet this act, so enigmatic to many of our modern theologians, was performed without any doubt or hesitation on the part of our Lord. The Divine call had reached Him, that He, the Holy One, should, according to the demands of the law, submit to the judgment of sinners. And this constituted, so to speak, the consecration for His work, to which He submitted, in anticipation both of the sufferings and the glory which were to come.

2. John was surprised when he saw Jesus coming to be baptized. The Baptist, no doubt, knew the prophecies which his parents had uttered concerning Jesus; probably, he was even personally acquainted with Him. Add to this the impression produced by the appearance of Jesus Himself. But all this was not sufficient to warrant him in presenting Jesus as the Messiah to the people: He had yet to await a distinct revelation to that effect. But it was more than sufficient to make him feel that baptism for purification was entirely inapplicable to the Lord, viewing Him in His personal character and dignity. Hence he could not but shrink, for the moment, from the tremendous consequences of his baptism; all the more, that in the presence of Jesus he felt more deeply than ever his own unworthiness and sinfulness: hence his refusal and his confession: "I have need to be baptized of Thee." But Jesus judged otherwise. The inference from the baptism of John was none other than that from the law itself, which again only reflected the sacred and solemn object of His incarnation and life. There is a *historical connection* between the Holy One and His sinful brethren; therefore must he suffer with and for them. Thus the baptism of John was not only applicable to Jesus, but attained its real meaning and object only by the baptism of Jesus. Thus it became the symbol of His consecration unto death, for the salvation of the world. Hence the exclamation of John, after the baptism of Jesus, "*Behold the Lamb of God!*"

It seems as if, in this controversy between Jesus and John, the Old and the New Testament had, for the time being, changed sides. John appears almost the representative of the liberty of the New, Christ that of the legal rigor of the Old Testament. "Thus the rods of Old Testament and of New Testament righteousness are here joined into a cross (*Leben Jesu*, ii. 1, p. 177). But the connection and unity between the two dispensations appears in this intertwining of its ultimate links.—Jesus conquers in this contest. More than ever before does the Baptist now humble himself, under a sense of the deep responsibility of his office. The Lord also humbles Himself under the law, to which he now formally becomes obedient unto death, even the death of the cross (Phil. ii.).

3. This is the only instance in which there is neither confession of sin on the part of Him who is baptized, nor reproof and exhortation on the part of the Baptist. The baptismal address comes from heaven itself; but the blessings of the baptism descend upon all mankind. Heaven once again opened at the baptism of Jesus—primarily for Him, and, through Him, for all mankind. The blessing which flowed from this baptism—the prophetic import of which attained its fulfilment in the death on the cross—appeared at the close of Christ's mission on earth, in the institution of holy baptism for His people, with the gracious blessing of the Trinity—Father, Son, and Holy Ghost—attaching to it. For this purpose did the Father reveal Himself on this occasion; for this purpose did Jesus obtain without measure the anointing of the Spirit; for this purpose did He as the Son throw open the portals of heaven, and offer himself by the Holy Ghost to the Father, for the salvation of the world.

4. The germs of the doctrine of the Trinity which occur in the Old Testament, are taken up in the commencement of the Gospel history, where the miraculous conception of Jesus through the Holy Ghost is announced (Matt. i.; Luke i.). This mystery is more clearly brought out in the narrative of Christ's baptism, and is more fully developed in the progress of the Gospel history. This shows that what is called the Trinity of *revelation* depends on the Trinity of *essence*. For the relation between the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, as here revealed, is preëminently that of nature or essence (ontological); while afterwards, in Matt. xxviii. 19, it appears more especially as a relation of manifestation or of revelation.

5. The glorification of Jesus by the voice from

heaven, heard at his baptism, may be regarded as the second stage in the miraculous events attending His life, by which he was gradually and increasingly manifested as the absolute Wonder, and hence as the Wonderful or Wonder-worker. The first of these heavenly attestations was His miraculous birth, and with it the star and the angels' hymn. Then followed the manifestation of Jesus at His baptism, when, instead of the voice of angels, that from heaven is heard, and which, from its utterance, we recognize as the voice of the Father. Instead of the star standing over Bethlehem, we have now the vision of a dove descending upon the Lord. This glorious manifestation becomes still brighter at the transfiguration of Jesus on the Mount. Here also the voice of the Father descends in the cloud upon the Mount—it is heard close by; while the fulness of the Spirit resting on Jesus shines forth in His personal appearance, as He stands transfigured before His disciples. Once more is the same voice heard: this time in the Temple, and in the midst of His people; and although it only conveys to Him personally the assurance that the name of the Father shall be glorified in Him, it appears to his followers to be the voice of an angel, to the people—the sound of thunder. This is the third occasion on which the voice from heaven is heard. Lastly, on the Mount of Olives He is carried upward to the Father in a cloud of glory, and by the power of the Spirit. The various stages of this direct attestation from heaven may thus be marked:—1. The miraculous origin of Christ from heaven; 2. the consecration, among His chosen ones, for His appearance in the form of a servant upon earth; 3. the prelude of the transformation of His earthly appearance as a servant, celebrated among His disciples; 4. the same as celebrated among the people; 5. the resurrection-glory, and the final transfiguration.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The mighty impulse of the Spirit leading Christ to Jordan. This appears from the circumstance, 1. that He came from a great distance; 2. that He came alone; 3. that He came fully decided on the course before Him.—Christ resolved on submitting to baptism.—Jesus does not shrink from the same baptismal bath which the "generation of vipers" had received.—The various humiliations to which Jesus submitted during His youthful course: 1. from Bethlehem to Egypt; 2. from the temple to Nazareth; 3. from His sacred retirement to the baptism of sinners.—How the Lord owned the Divine institution of baptism.—How He honored the sacred office.—The twofold difficulty of John's work: 1. He was obliged to baptize the Pharisees and Sadducees; 2. he had to baptize the Lord.—John himself required the grace of the Lord.—How the Baptist confessed that he stood in need of the baptism of Jesus.—How the holy office entrusted to ministers must tend to humble those who are in earnest, but how it also elevates them.—The greatness of John as appearing most fully in his humility.—He who was baptized greater than he who baptized.—"Suffer it to be so *now*." The infinite import of the word *now:* 1. A summing up of eternity in time, and of time in "to-day," and of "to-day" in the moment which claims our decision; 2. an enigma propounded by the past and solved by the future; 3. an altar on which our obedience is claimed, and a blessing promised; 4. a passing phase of earth, which may be transformed into a revelation of heaven.—"Suffer it to be so *now:* 1. Suffer it *at last* to be so; 2. suffer it *quickly* to be so; 3. suffer it to be so *for a moment;* 4. suffer it to be so *once for all*.—The baptism of Jesus the fulfilment of all righteousness, 1. so far as the mission of John was concerned; 2. so far as the demands of the law were concerned; 3. so far as the dealings of God with men, according to the fundamental principles of His administration, were concerned.—Import of the fact that the Holy One submitted to the baptism of sinners: 1. Sinners must be immersed in the waters of judgment. 2. The Sinless One is immersed along with them, in order to give them courage for the judgment. 3. He must be immersed for them to change that judgment, so far as they are concerned, into salvation.—The glory of the Lord in this great act of His humiliation.—The manifestation of the Messiah.—The manifestation of the Messiah in the glorious light of the Trinity.—"*Out of the water*," a watchword of life. 1. The earth out of water; 2. Noah and his race out of the water; 3. Moses and his people out of the water; 4. Christ and His Church out of the water.—Heaven opened on the occasion of baptism. 1. Heaven is opened, *a.* for all the blessings which come down from above; *b.* for all the prayers which ascend from below. 2. It is opened over him who is baptized: *a.* over the Lord Himself; *b.* over all who are baptized in His name.—Heaven opened: the heart of the Father opened.—"*The Spirit of God descending like a dove:*" 1. In His *purity* like a dove; hence He finds at first only one resting-place—the head and heart of Jesus. 2. In His *gentleness* like a dove; hence addressing Himself to man. 3. In His *harmlessness* like the dove; hence conquering the wicked one. 4. In His *love* as the dove; hence imparting life to the Church.—The voice from heaven in the manifestation of Christ, and its echo in the justification of the sinner.—How the three tokens accompanying the baptism of Christ are spiritually repeated in every baptism. 1. Heaven is opened to the child which is now placed by the side of the Son. 2. The dovelike mind of the Holy Spirit is imparted by the Son to the child. 3. In the testimony to the Son the child hears the testimony of sonship, and of the Father's good pleasure.—The baptism of Jesus as the sealing of His name.—The baptism of Jesus the manifestation of His humiliation and exaltation: 1. As His first actual and personal humiliation and exaltation; 2. as throwing light upon the humiliation and exaltation of His childhood; 3. as the token of His future humiliation and exaltation; 4. as the act deciding the future humiliation and exaltation of His whole life.—Jesus undertaking His work in full consciousness of what awaited Him, and being attested by the Father and the Holy Ghost.—The blessedness springing from certitude of the Divine call.

Starke:—God has in His wisdom fixed for every one of us the proper time when we are to come forth.—However highly placed a man may be, he should pay all becoming reverence to the Divine institution of the word and sacraments.—Humility a precious gem.—Christ has consecrated the washing of regeneration.—Let us be careful to know what "becometh us" at every time.—Heaven, which was closed by the first Adam, is opened again over the second.—To us also has heaven again been opened by Christ, the Lord from heaven.

Gossner:—As soon as the sinner opens his heart to God in repentance, God opens the heavens and owns him as His child.

FIFTH SECTION.

JESUS RENOUNCING THE WORLD, AND COMMENCING HIS CONQUEST OF IT. WHILE PREPARING FOR THE PUBLIC DISCHARGE OF HIS OFFICE, HE HAS TO ENCOUNTER THE THREEFOLD TEMPTATION OF SATAN, CORRESPONDING TO THE THREEFOLD FORM IN WHICH A WORLDLY-MINDED PEOPLE HAVE SHAPED TO THEMSELVES THEIR HOPES OF THE MESSIAH. THUS JESUS IS CONSTRAINED TO CONCEAL HIS DIGNITY FROM THE PEOPLE, AND TO COMMENCE HIS WORK IN THE DESPISED DISTRICT OF GALILEE. BUT GOD GLORIFIES HIM IN THE HOMAGE PAID TO HIM BY HIS DISCIPLES AND THE PEOPLE.

CHAPTER IV. (Mark i. 12–20; Luke iv. 1–13; v. 1–11; John i. 19–28; iv. 43–46).

CONTENTS:—The threefold temptation of Christ by Satan through the secular notions of the Jews concerning the Messiah, and His threefold victory over the Tempter.

A. CHAPTER IV. 1–11.

(The Gospel for *Invocavit*, or First Sunday in *Lent.*)

1 Then was Jesus led up of [by][1] the Spirit into the wilderness, to be tempted of
2 [by][1] the devil. And when he had fasted forty days and forty nights, he was after-
3 ward a hungered.[2] And when the tempter came to him, he said, If thou be the Son
4 of God, command that these stones be made bread. But he answered and said, It is
written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of
5 the mouth of God. Then the devil taketh him up into the holy city, and setteth him
6 on a [the][3] pinnacle of the temple, And saith unto him, If thou be the Son of God,
cast thyself down: for it is written, he shall give his angels charge concerning thee:
and in *their* hands they shall bear thee up, lest at any time[4] thou dash thy foot against
7 a stone. Jesus said unto him, It is written again,[5] Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy
8 God. Again, the devil taketh him up into an exceeding high mountain, and sheweth
9 him all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them; And saith unto him, All
10 these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me. Then saith Je-
sus unto him, Get thee hence, Satan: for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy
11 God, and him only shalt thou serve. Then the devil leaveth him, and, behold, angels
came and ministered unto him.

[1] Ver. 1.—[*By* is more expressive of ὑπό as distinct from ἐκ.]

[2] Ver. 2.—[Brit. ed.: *an* hungered. Better in modern and usual English: *He afterward hungered*, or *was hungry*.]

[3] Ver. 5.—[Gr. τὸ πτερύγιον. See Com.]

[4] Ver. 6.—[*Lest haply*, μήποτε.]

[5] Ver. 7.—[*Again* it is w., πάλιν γέγραπται.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

On the LITERATURE of the History of the Temptation, comp. Danz, p. 993, and *Supplement*, p. 109; Winer, i. 556, *Supplement*, p. 79; Hase, *Leben Jesu*, §55. On the history itself, comp. Ullmann on the *Sinlessness of Jesus;* Alex. Schweizer, *Ueber die Dignität des Religionsstifters*, in the "*Theol. Stud. u. Kritiken*," vii. 564. For other works, comp. Meyer's "Commentary," p. 100. See also especially Könemann, *Ueber die Versuchungsgeschichte* in "Rudelbach's *Zeitschrift*" for 1850; and Laufs in the "*Stud. u. Kritiken*" for 1853, p. 355.

We have no right, with Ewald and Meyer, to infer from the mysterious character of the history before us, and from the detailed and circumstantial manner in which it is related, that the account given by Matthew (and by Luke) is a later embellishment of the more simple and older tradition recorded in the Gospel by Mark. Evidently, Mark furnishes only a general summary of the event, which requires to be supplemented by the details furnished by Matthew and Luke.

Ver. 1. Then was Jesus.—Τότε, *i. e.*, after the Spirit had descended upon Him. The first operation of the Holy Spirit, when the Lord had attained to the full consciousness of His character as the God-Man, and of His work as the Redeemer, was, not to lead Him into that world which He was to save, but to drive Him out of it into the wilderness. No doubt the primary object of this was to afford an opportunity for blessed rest and joy, in the consciousness of His character and mission. But, secondly, the Saviour had now to consider the difficult question, how to reveal Himself to His people, without conforming to their spurious, secularized views and hopes concerning the Messiah. It was this counterfeit of the true Messiah among Israel which, so to speak, repelled Him, and drove Him into the wilderness. The third motive for His going into the wilderness lay in the fact, that the reign of Satan was the cause of all the misery in the world. Hence Christ had to commence His work by conquering Satan; and this He did for the whole world, when He met and

overcame him in the personal contest here described.

He was led up, ἀνήχθη,—*i. e.*, from the desert banks of the river to the wilderness of Judæa properly so called. Tradition has given to this wilderness the name of *Quarantania* (wilderness of Jericho, Josh. xvi. 1). Comp. Robinson II. 552 [i. 567]; Schubert iii. 73; v. Raumer, p. 47. "From Joppa, on the Mediterranean, the road leads by Ramlah for about seven hours through the beautiful plain of Sharon. Other six hours' journey over the calcareous and desert mountain tract of Judah brings you to Jerusalem. The road is exceedingly difficult, going alternately up and down hill. From Jerusalem the mountain tract extends for other five hours eastward, when it descends into the valley of Jordan by Jericho. At this eastern slope of the chain is the steep mountain called *Quarantania*, where, according to tradition, the temptation of Christ took place. The name is derived from the Lord's fasting for forty days. According to Hasselquist, the mountain is high and conical, and most dangerous of ascent. A deep precipice descends at the side of it. On the summit are the ruins of an ancient Greek monastery, perhaps that built by the Empress Helena. All along the mountain are caves and holes, which formerly were tenanted by hermits; at the base a brook springs,—according to tradition, the same which Elisha healed (2 Kings ii. 19–22)." For further particulars, comp. v. Raumer, as above, Note 78. The district is better explored in the direction from the Mount of Olives. "The wilderness of Jericho, extending between that town and the Mount of Olives, or rather Bethany, is a district full of precipitous rocks and deep hollows (comp. Joseph. *Antiq.* x. 8, 2). The scene presents the appearance of a most desolate wilderness, especially after passing the Caravansary which now bears the name of the *Khan of the Samaritan* (comp. Luke x. 30), about two hours from Jerusalem: comp. Maundrell, *Journey*, p. 109. From this wilderness the road descends, after a further journey of two hours, down a precipitous height into the plain of Jericho. At the northern boundary of this plain rises a steep, calcareous mountain, very difficult of ascent, which bears the name of *Quarantania, because, according to tradition, Jesus passed forty days fasting in one of the many caves on its side.* The northern portion of this desert was connected with the wilderness of Bethany, Josh. xviii. 12." Winer, art. "*Wüste*," No. 4.—As the wilderness of Quarantania lies close by the banks of Jordan, there is no sufficient reason to doubt the correctness of this tradition. The wildness of this desert, as indicated in the expression of Mark: "He was with the wild beasts," points to the same conclusion.

Of (by) the Spirit.—The context shows that the Holy Spirit is here meant. The idea that it referred to the personal spirit of Christ, or to a state of ecstasy (Paulus), could only have been broached from defective theological views. The expression ἀνήχθη implies, indeed, an extraordinary state of mind on the part of the Lord, indicating a wonderful impulse, but not a *miraculous* transportation (which is not meant even in Acts viii. 39, or in 2 Kings ii. 16)—an idea still more clearly expressed in the parallel passage in Mark i. 12. Meyer aptly remarks: "The two opposite principles, ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος and ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου, are evidently here placed in pragmatic correspondence or juxtaposition. Besides, the whole circumstances of this history, occurring immediately after the descent of the Spirit upon Jesus, show that the Evangelist intended to relate the victory of Jesus, full of the Holy Spirit, over the devil (comp. Luke iv. 1, 2). This consideration alone is sufficient to refute the arbitrary invention of Olshausen, that, during the forty days in the wilderness, Jesus had been forsaken by the Spirit."

To be tempted of (by) the devil; πειρασθῆναι.—Such was the final object. The Holy Spirit led Him purposely to this contest with Satan. In this conflict He was to be tempted by the devil, to show whether or not, in the exercise of His free determination, He would prove Himself, and continue, the organ of the Holy Spirit in opposition to that satanic principle, or spirit of the world, by which the hopes of Israel concerning the Messiah had been perverted, so as to become even matter of temptation to Him. The basis and commencement of the work of salvation was necessarily a personal contest and victory of the Saviour over the principle of evil, as manifested in the corruption of the world. For further remarks on the tremendous collision between these antagonistic principles, comp. the author's "*Leben Jesu*" ii. 1, p. 205.—Διάβολος, from διαβάλλω, *to throw over, carry across, to slander, accuse, calumniate;* hence διάβολος, the *slanderer* in general, and also, in the most particular sense (Job i.; Rev. xii. 10), the *accuser*. In the Old Testament he is called *Satan*, שָׂטָן (Job i. 6–12). The term means, adversary in general, adversary in war (1 Kings v. 4—in the Hebr. text, v. 18; xi. 14); and with the article, הַשָּׂטָן, the adversary or enemy κατ' ἐξοχήν: the prince of the fallen spirits (Gen. iii.; 2 Cor. xi. 3; Rev. xx. 2; John viii. 44, etc.).

As the cause and origin of the fall of man, Satan is the prince of the kingdom of darkness, which has sprung up and developed on earth in opposition to the theocracy; the seducer of man to their destruction, and hence the principal enemy of Jesus (Matt. xiii. 28). Comp. works on Dogmatics (among others my *Positive Dogmatik*, p. 559 sqq.) on the question whether the devil should be regarded as a person, or merely as the symbol of what is called the principle of evil (as if what is evil could have a real, and not what merely appears to be a principle).

Ver. 2. **And when He had fasted forty days.**—Besides the mythical theory, which we at once set aside, there are four different views entertained by commentators in connection with this event. *First*, as regards Christ's *fasting*, some refer it only to the want of His common nourishment (Rosenmüller, Kuinoel, Kuhn, etc.); while most interpreters understand it as meaning absolute and entire abstinence from food (comp. Luke iv. 2; Deut. ix. 9). *Secondly*, as regards the *duration*, some critics regard the "forty days" as a sacred number, and hence as denoting an indefinite period of time (Köster, Henneberg, Neander); while most commentators take it literally. In favor of the literal view, we refer to the circumstance that Moses and Elijah fasted for forty days (Ex. xxxiv. 28, and 1 Kings xix. 8), in both which instances we have a record of supernatural and miraculous events. Besides, the addition of the clause, "*forty nights*," and the remark in Luke iv. 2, "*He did eat nothing*," show that both the time and the act are not meant figuratively. Still the expression must not be understood as implying a legal and absolute fast of forty days. Similarly, Jesus said of John that he came "neither eating nor drinking," although we know that his nourishment consisted of

locusts and wild honey. The feature which characterized this solemn fast, and distinguished it from every similar event, was, that the Saviour was wholly absorbed by spiritual realities; a state which, although never fully attained by any person, yet, even in the modified degree reached by ordinary men, renders them, for a considerable period, independent of the common necessaries of life. The fast of Jesus formed a striking contrast to the worldly-mindedness of the Jews (as that of Moses and of Elijah had been); it was a higher expression of the feelings and of the fasting of the Baptist; and at last, when, after the lapse of forty days, **He was an hungered** [or **hungry**], it became the occasion for the grand assault of the tempter. Comp. our remarks on the freedom of some men from common wants under extraordinary circumstances in the "*Leben Jesu*" ii. 1, p. 212; Heubner, p. 34.

Ver. 3. **And the tempter came to Him.**—The participle πειράζων is here used as a substantive, as characteristic of the person. It is one of the chief characteristics of Satan that he is the tempter. First, the tempter in the guise of a friend, then the accuser and open enemy. Various views are entertained as to the manner in which the tempter approached the Lord, or, in other words, as to the mode of this temptation. We may reduce the different explanations to five classes. The temptation has been regarded, 1. as an external occurrence; 2. as a supernatural internal occurrence, or a vision; 3. as an inward ethical transaction, or a psychological occurrence; 4. as a parable; 5. as a myth.—Again, viewing it as an *objective* or *external occurrence*, it has been regarded, (*a*) as real, in the sense of having been a literal apparition of Satan in the form of a man or an angel. This is the view of many orthodox commentators. But against this, we set the fact, that under no other circumstances, and at no other period, Satan had ever assumed human form; and also, that there are other circumstances in this narrative which cannot be taken in their literal sense,—such as, that Satan took the Lord to the holy city, or that he placed Him on a high mountain, from which *all* the kingdoms of this world and their glory could be seen. It has been argued, (*b*) that what the Evangelist here describes as a real objective occurrence, must be traced to earliest tradition, which invested the symbolical idea of a contest between Messiah and Satan in this mythical form (Strauss); or else, that the misunderstanding must be ascribed to the Evangelists themselves, who viewed and recorded as something external what in reality was an inward transaction, and either told them in the form of a parable, or else was only intended as a parable (Schleiermacher). To this view, in a somewhat modified shape, we shall again advert in the sequel. Meantime suffice it to say, that the idea of a myth must be at once discarded, whatever we may say of the other suggestions advanced. Or, (*c*) it has been maintained that an external occurrence is here described in symbolical language, and that the tempter was an ordinary man. "This," says Meyer, "is the case with the absurd suggestion of some interpreters, who substitute for the devil an ordinary personage, such as a member of the Sanhedrim, or a priest, who had come to question and to gain over Jesus, or to lay a snare for Him." (V. der Hardt, Venturini, Möller, Rosenmüller, Kuinoel, Feilmoser; see also Bengel, who thinks that Satan had appeared "*sub schemate γραμματέως quia τὸ γέγραπται ei ter opponitur.*") However, the suggestion that the devil employed some member of the Sanhedrim as his *special* instrument—which, of course, Rationalists would repudiate [but which is evidently the meaning of the orthodox and pious Bengel—P. S.]—can scarcely be characterized either as rationalistic or as absurd. We know, for example, that Satan did employ Judas as his special instrument (John xiii. 27), and that "this devil" came out against the Lord as His enemy (John xiv. 30). Still, this view does not quite agree with the symbolical elements contained in the narrative before us.—According to the second interpretation above mentioned, the whole occurrence was merely a *vision*. In that case, it may be regarded, (*a*) as a vision called forth by the devil (Origen, Cyprian, Theodorus of Mopsuestia on Luke iv. 1, Olshausen, and latterly again Heubner, p. 39). Against this we urge, that the devil could not have possessed the power of presenting to the Lord in a vision, either his own apparition, or the pictures of these temptations. (*b*) As called forth by God Himself (Farmer, *Enquiry*, etc., London, 1761),—a view which would render this occurrence wholly mysterious and unintelligible; or (*c*) as called forth by natural causes (Clericus, Paulus, Gratz, and many other commentators),—not a historical event, but a psychological and ecstatic state of mind; or lastly, (*d*) a "significant morning dream" (Meyer [not the commentator, H. A. W., so often quoted in this work, see below] in the "*Studien u. Kritiken*" for 1831, p. 319 sqq.). But it is sufficient to reply that decisive ethical conflicts do not take place in the form of dreams.—According to the third view above mentioned, this narrative must be considered as an *inward ethical transaction* or *conflict:* (*a*) A conflict which took place in the imagination of Christ (Eichhorn, Dereser, Weisse, etc.). Against this view it has been urged, that such an inward conflict, arising from a felt sense of the allurements of evil, could not be reconciled with the sinlessness of Jesus. (*b*) An inward conflict excited by the devil (Krabbe); but we are at a loss to know the medium through which the enemy assailed Christ. (*c*) An inward transaction to which the disciples gave an objective form, as if it had been an external event (rejection of the false conceptions concerning the Messiah—Ullmann); but if we dismiss the idea that they *consciously* and *purposely* clothed the event in a symbolical form, we are shut up to the mythical theory. (*d*) A fragmentary, symbolical representation of transactions in the inner life of Jesus (Neander). But this were to spiritualize away and to weaken a great historical fact.—According to the fourth view above mentioned, we are to regard this narrative as a *parable*, not so much of what Jesus Himself had experienced, but of what His disciples should keep in view and guard against (J. E. Chr. Schmidt, Schleiermacher, Usteri, Alex. Schweizer, Baumgarten-Crusius). But de Wette rightly objects, that in that case the whole meaning of a temptation would be lost—and, let us add, of *the temptation* κατ' ἐξοχήν. (Against this parabolic view, comp. also Hasert, in the "*Stud. u. Krit.*" for 1830.)—Lastly, according to the fifth view above proposed, we must regard this narrative as a pure *myth* (Strauss, de Wette, Gfrörer, Meyer). Thus Meyer boldly asserts, that "nothing is left but to conclude that what the Evangelists considered and described as an actual event, was merely an ideal event, or a myth."* In reply, we simply remark

* [H. A. W. Meyer ad Matt. iv. p. 109, pronounces the Temptation an *ideal history*, i. e. a *myth*, which arose among the Jewish Christians from the anti-diabolical idea of the Messiah, but which already St. John silently excluded from

that modern theology has happily overcome the mythical theory. The only thing mythical, in our opinion, is the view entertained by some divines, by which the sacred history, so full of symbolical significance and religious life, is transformed into a purely external transaction.—The main objection to the various explanations which we have just sketched, is that they proceed on the old scholastic plan of predicating an absolute alternative (a mode of interpretation which has frequently obstructed the right interpretation of Scripture), and that they do not sufficiently appreciate the various moral agencies brought into play, and their mutual influence. Nothing appears to us more natural, than that immediately after the baptism, in which Christ entered upon His work as Saviour of the world, He should have encountered and entered upon a spiritual conflict with the spurious ideas which the men of His age entertained about the Messiah. The influence of these perverted views concerning the Messiah upon His own mind, would necessarily give rise to an assault and temptation of Satan. In truth, Satan had thus perverted the hope of Israel concerning the Messiah, for the very purpose of turning aside the Messiah Himself. Thus far, then, the narrative presents an inward transaction indeed; but, at the same time, also a real and actual transaction between Christ on the one hand, and the popular expectations and the kingdom of Satan on the other. But what had at first been an inward transaction, concluded with an outward event, which in some respects is mysterious. Satan really employed, it seems to us, some of the chief priests and scribes as his instruments to tempt Christ to undertake the part of such a worldly Messiah as the Jews at the time expected. (Comp. the ὀπίσω μου here and Matt. xvi. 23.) The whole history of this temptation—both in its inward and outward phases—Jesus afterward communicated to His disciples in the form of a real narrative, clothed in symbolical language. The difference between this and a mere myth lies in the simple fact, that it really took place, partly as an inward, and partly as an outward transaction; and in the circumstance that speaker and hearers employed and listened to the symbolical language in which the narrative was partly clothed, in the full consciousness that it was such. The various interpretations to which we have above adverted ignore several important circumstances; such as, that, in accordance with his mission, it was the *duty* of John to point out the Messiah to His people, and, of course, more especially to the representatives of the people; that, at the very time when Jesus was in the neighborhood, a deputation from the Sanhedrim at Jerusalem had arrived to inquire whether he was the Messiah; that John returned, and *must* have returned, a truthful reply; and lastly, that this deputation *could not but* take some notice of the directions which the Baptist had given them. Besides, we must remember that, at the commencement of Christ's work, it was not merely some kind of temptation, but *the great* temptation, which had to be overcome—*i.e.*, the temptation arising from the lust of the world, even as, at the close of His course, He had to encounter the temptation from the burden and grief of the world. Lastly, it is manifest that so decisive an inward conflict could not be merely the result of an extraordinary state of mind, without having been called forth by some deep *historical antagonism;* and that, as it could be neither wholly internal nor wholly external, it must have combined both these elements, or, in other words, that it was caused and excited by the devil, and carried into execution through a human medium. We can readily conceive how human sympathies, more particularly Jewish chiliastic influences, may have acted upon the human nature of Christ. Nor can we doubt that a definite outward instrumentality was employed. Such could not have been wanting in this grand decisive moment of the history of the kingdom of God; and the glorious reality and the consequences of such an era, are themselves sufficient to sweep away the cobweb structures of any mythical theory. Hence we agree, 1. with Ullmann, in admitting that the transaction was inward, but caused by external agency; 2. with v. d. Hardt and Bengel, in believing that the transaction concluded with an outward event, to which only allusion is made in the narrative; 3. with Schleiermacher, in concluding that the history is clothed in a symbolical and parabolic garb.

Vers. 3 and 4. *First temptation.*—The first temptation is occasioned by a feeling of hunger on the part of Jesus, and by the expression of it. **If Thou be the Son of God,** v. 3—couched in the form of a doubt to incite the Saviour to prove Himself such. The word υἱός is put first, to lay emphasis on the Sonship. The expression implies three things: First, that if the Son of God had come, He must be the expected Messiah. Secondly, that the Messiah could not be any lower personage than the Son of God Himself, in the metaphysical sense of this term. Thirdly, that the greatest miracles might be expected to be wrought by Him.—Εἰπὲ, ἵνα, **Speak, in order that.** The effect is to be produced by a creative, or rather a magical utterance. It may be asked whether the tempter meant this in the literal or the symbolical sense, like the statement of the Baptist: "God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham." Whatever view we take of this point, it was a covert suggestion to give Himself up to the satanic principle, either by arbitrarily perverting the spiritual power of working miracles into an unholy art of magic, or as a call, in pompous Oriental phraseology, to transform the wilderness into a storehouse, by pronouncing a formula of surrender to the vanity of the world. Probably the tempter intended that it should bear a double meaning, as was also the case with the second temptation. The point of the temptation lay in the suggestion that it seemed incompatible for the Son of God, who could do all things, to suffer hunger. But—doubt would add—to suffer hunger seems to imply that you are not the Son of God. Thus, in the present instance, the doubt would appeal to His power, to His reason, and even to the duty of confirming the declaration that He was the Son of God. The Son of God cannot be limited or hardly beset; He cannot suffer or participate in the wants of humanity; He must at once sweep away every difficulty and want by an act of omnipotence. The Lord resisted this temptation by quoting the Scripture, Deut. viii. 3,—the passage being quoted by the Evangelist according to the Septuagint. The original (addressed to Israel) reads: "Jehovah suffered thee to hunger, and fed thee with manna (which

the evangelical record. Still he afterward claims for this myth a *historical truth*, inasmuch as it symbolizes the *real fact* of Christ's victory over the empire of Satan, which runs through his *whole life*. But this concession removes the ground for all valid objection to the real historical character of the narrative. For what is internally true and consistent may become a real fact. Of Hegel's maxim: *Alles Vernünftige ist wirklich, und alles Wirkliche ist vernünftig*, the first clause (*everything reasonable is real*) is more truthful than the second.—P. S.]

thou knowest not, neither did thy fathers know), that He might make thee know that man doth not live by bread (upon bread) only, but by everything (upon everything) that proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord doth man live." The Septuagint renders: ἀλλ' ἐπὶ παντὶ ῥήματι τῷ ἐκπορευομένῳ διὰ στόματος Θεοῦ ζήσεται ὁ ἄνθρωπος. In the Gospel of Matthew we have ἐν instead of ἐπί—**in**, or **by, every word** (not thing) **that proceedeth out of the mouth of God shall man live.** According to Olshausen, the Saviour intended to point out an antithesis between earthly and heavenly food. De Wette suggests the following explanation: "If ordinary means of nourishment fail, the Lord will employ extraordinary means to preserve us alive by His creative Word." But these extraordinary means—the manna—are here generalized as "everything that proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord," and applied in a symbolical sense, to indicate that man is not absolutely dependent upon any kind of external nourishment, and that his real life is sustained by the word of God. Hence the meaning of Christ's reply is this: If even man is not absolutely dependent upon the bread that perisheth,—if he does not live upon bread only, but rather upon the word of God,—how much more must this be true of the Son of God, whose life flows from the Father, and not from the bread of earth, and who accordingly depends for the preservation of His earthly life, not on any arbitrary interference, nor on satanic device or agency, but on the Father? But the Son of God has condescended to become man, and as such is willing to share the wants and sufferings of humanity. In conclusion, the difference between the idea of miracles as laid down in the Bible, and that entertained by the tempter—or even by some modern theologians—deserves notice.

Vers. 5–7. *Second temptation.*—In the Gospel of Luke this is mentioned as the third temptation. This divergence arises not from any historical inaccuracy, but from the symbolical view which each of the Evangelists connected with these assaults. The symbolical element which appeared in the first temptation, "Command that these stones be made bread," comes out more distinctly in the present instance. We trace it, first, in the significant expression, παραλαμβάνει αὐτόν, *he takes Him by force with him*, or *takes Him to himself as a companion* (in his journey); and, secondly, in the term εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν πόλιν, עִיר הַקֹּדֶשׁ (Is. xlviii. 2; Neh. xi. 1), to denote Jerusalem,—so called on account of the temple. (To this day the Arabs call Jerusalem the place of the Sanctuary, or the Holy City.) The devil is here represented as having free access to the most sacred places, and as familiar with them: **He setteth Him** (ἵστησιν)—not by force, for such he cannot exercise; besides, he had not yet dropt the mask and shown himself the evil one. He appears as wearing a religious garb, as one who had authority in the temple, and *setteth* Jesus as his guest in a spot which commanded the most extensive view. The supposition of Jerome, that Jesus was carried thither through the air, is purely fantastic;* equally unsatisfactory is the suggestion of Olshausen, that He was in a state of mental transport. It is quite possible that Jesus had at the time gone for a day to Jerusalem, and that this circumstance may have formed the external basis for this temptation. Be this as it may, the fact that Satan set Jesus on the (not a) **pinnacle** [literally: **the wing**] **of the temple** (τὸ πτερύγιον τοῦ ἱεροῦ), implied the suggestion that He should by satanic means become the priest-king of that temple. It is true, the expression τοῦ ἱεροῦ here used, was applied to the whole set of buildings connected with the temple, while the word ναός referred to the principal building of the temple. But the more general expression of course included the temple itself, to which, besides, the word πτερύγιον specially points. Nor is there anything inconsistent in the account of Josephus, that the roof of the temple was covered κατὰ κορυφήν with pointed rods to protect it from being occupied by birds, as the κορυφή of the temple was probably only the most holy place. Nor can the great sacredness of the locality be urged as an argument, since the special object in view was to place Jesus in the most sacred locality. The real difficulty of taking the statement, that the Lord was set upon a pinnacle of the temple, in its literal meaning, lies in this, that Christ was neither priest nor Levite, and that the idea of setting Him publicly in such a place is entirely incompatible with a secret conflict between Christ and Satan. On the same ground we must dismiss the notion, that the devil set him on any other prominent place of the temple. Some commentators have supposed that this "pinnacle" belonged to an out-building of the temple, such as the hall of Solomon on the east side (Joseph. *Antiq.* xx. 9, 7), or the στοὰ βασιλική on the south side (*ibid.* xv. 11, 5), both of them rising along a frightful precipice. Kuinoel, Meyer, and others suppose that the scene must have occurred at the south side of the temple, from the description which Josephus gives of its dizzy height. But this would necessitate the strange supposition, that the Evangelist represented the tempter as proposing to the Lord a descent, either into the poor valley of Kidron, or into that of the Cheesemakers. If the narrative is taken literally, the object must have been rather to work some ostentatious miracle for the proud city of Jerusalem itself. In this respect, also, the temptation had its double meaning, the main point lying in the suggestion that Jesus should yield to Satan, place Himself at the head of the priesthood, and in that character be presented to the people. With this object, and in this sense, Jesus was set on the pinnacle of the temple, and probably somehow or somewhere in the temple itself. The spiritual attitude which He was to assume is the main point.

As Jesus had turned aside the first suggestion of the tempter by the word of God, the enemy supported his second assault, **If Thou be the Son of God, cast Thyself down,** by a quotation from Ps. xci. 11, 12, "**For He shall give His angels charge over thee, to keep thee in all thy ways: they shall bear thee up in their hands, lest thou dash thy foot against a stone.**" This passage seemed all the better suited for the purpose in view, since in its primary application it referred not exclusively to the Messiah. The plain inference was, that if such a promise had been granted to all pious men, it must apply all the more forcibly to the Messiah. But the application of this promise was evidently false, as the expression, **in all thy ways**, was not equivalent to *the ways of thine own choosing.* Indeed, the tempter wholly omitted this clause when adducing the passage. Jesus replied to this quotation—which in its original form was a poetical de-

* Connected with this view are other similar notions formerly entertained, such as, that the wilderness was that of Arabia,—the mountain, Mount Sinai, or Mount Tabor, or Mount Nebo; that Jesus was in a state of lowest humiliation, and passive in the hands of Satan, who carried him away through the air, etc. Comp. Starke.

scription of the promised help, and now was grossly misinterpreted in its literal application—by referring to a passage in the law: **Ye shall not tempt Jehovah your God,** ver. 7. Deut. vi. 16. In the present instance, Christ addressed it to Satan personally, **Thou,** instead of **Ye,**—a change all the more appropriate, that every tempting of God on the part of man is directly caused by the enemy of souls. Πάλιν does not mean "on the other hand" (Erasmus and others), but **again** (Meyer, Engl. C. Ver.). Bengel: *Scriptura per Scripturam interpretanda*—more especially a poetical phrase by the precise statements of the law. This reply to Satan is already an attack upon him, since he is here characterized as tempting the Lord.

Vers. 8–10. *Third temptation.*—"The **high mountain** (ver. 8) from which **all the kingdoms of the world** could be seen, must not be looked for upon any of our maps; it neither refers to the Mount of Olives, nor does κόσμος mean Palestine (Kuinoel), but it applies to the heathen world over which Satan held exclusive dominion" (Meyer). Luke adds, ἐν στιγμῇ χρόνου, to indicate the magic character of the vision. **And the glory of them,** τὴν δόξαν αὐτῶν. "The rich country, the splendid cities and palaces, perhaps also the riches which they contained (although these could scarcely have been seen from the top of a mountain)."—De Wette. The idea of any magical influence of Satan upon the vision of the Lord seems to us quite inappropriate (comp. Lange: "*Worte der Abwehr*," p. 41). It is not worth while to show at length that Satan could not have exercised such influence over the eyes of the Saviour. In our opinion, the prospect from such a high mountain as that of the wilderness of Quarantania, or near Jerusalem, was sufficient to offer an appropriate basis for a rhetorical description of the world, its kingdoms, and their glory.* Of course the mountain must still be viewed as a symbolical expression, to designate the political and chiliastic prospects which the Jews portrayed to themselves at the time when Messiah should come to conquer the world by worldly means. Nor must we, with Meyer, exclude Palestine from this vista, since the course of the ambitious conqueror, as sketched by the enemy, was to commence at the temple itself. For, although it is true that Satan had greater power over the heathen world than over Palestine, we must not confound (as Meyer does, p. 105) the later views of the Jews (as given in Eisenmenger's "*Entdecktes Judenthum*," ii. p. 820, etc.) with those of the New Testament. In the New Testament Satan is designated as ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου (John xii. 31), with special reference to his sway over Palestine in opposition to Jesus; while the expression κοσμοκράτωρ, in Eph. vi. 12, alludes more particularly to the heresies by which the Church of Christ was endangered. We must not look in the word of God for the gross, fanatical, and mythical ideas of later rabbinical Judaism. The passage before us refers to the moral reign of darkness which extended over the whole ancient world, although we must ever be careful not to admit the validity of Satan's pretension that he exercised in any sense absolute sway over the world.

In this third temptation, Satan appears in his proper character. Hence also it is not prefaced by "If Thou be the Son of God." On the contrary, he rather seems to claim this honor for himself, as Luke plainly indicates in the words, ὅτι ἐμοὶ παραδέδοται. The awful proposal, that Jesus should fall down and worship Satan, and do him homage, is to some extent modified, when we bear in mind the peculiar political and religious import of the word προσκυνεῖν among Orientals. We do not imagine that Satan intended to demand an act of absolute adoration, but an act of homage, which, however, necessarily implied worship. Primarily, it was not (as Strauss supposes) a temptation to idolatry, though it is true that, in its ultimate meaning and bearing, all idolatry is devil-worship. Nor does this demand involve a direct threat on the part of Satan that he would let loose against Jesus the whole power of evil (Ebrard), although Satan's claim to absolute sway over the whole world implied that he was its lord and master. Viewed in this light, the third temptation, from the lust of the world, pointed already to that which Christ had to endure at the close of His course from the sorrow and misery of the world. The incredible presumption and impudence of Satan's demand (which, indeed, was covertly implied even in the first and second temptations) is in some measure accounted for by his well-known axiom, "that every man has his price at which his virtue may be bought." The point of the temptation lay in the boldness of the design—Satan spreading out all at once a rushing picture of absolute sway over the world and of its glory, and then offering all this to the lowly and rejected Son of David, who of right could claim all the nations of the world as His inheritance, and the utmost ends of the world as His possession. Gerlach suggests that the proposal to found the kingdom of Messiah by outward power and pomp, and not that of paying outward worship to Satan, formed the main point of the temptation. But this must evidently have been the consequence of a surrender and homage to Satan.

Ver. 10. **Then saith Jesus unto him.**—At last the mask was thrown off: Satan appears in his real character, and is treated accordingly. Hitherto the Lord had, in compliance with the usual forms of intercourse, dealt with him according to his assumed character, as one who seemed anxious to promote the mission of the Messiah, although He sufficiently showed that he had read the motives of Satan,—having in His first reply designated him as one who held men in contempt, and in His second as the tempter. But now he meets the pretensions of Satan to absolute power by a display of His own supreme authority. **Get thee hence, Satan.** [In Greek a single word, ὕπαγε, *begone, out of my sight.*] (The addition ὀπίσω μου is not sufficiently authenticated, and apparently an ancient interpretation derived from Matt. xvi. 23, which seems to apply not to Satan, but to Peter, whose right place as a follower of the Lord was *behind*, not *before* Him.) The passage with which Christ dismisses the enemy (Deut. vi. 13) is none other than the fundamental principle of Monotheism. It is given in the form of a free quotation from the Septuagint; the word προσκυνήσεις, which Satan had used, being retained, instead of φοβηθήσῃ. Laying emphasis on the main idea of the Old Testament passage, our Lord says, "Him

[* Jos. Addison Alexander on Matt. iv. 8 (p. 85), places the scene of this temptation on the Mount of Olives, and thus explains the vision of all the kingdoms: "*Sheweth*, causes Him to see, not upon a map or picture . . . nor by an optical illusion . .; but either by a voluntary and miraculous extension of His vision on His own part, or by a combination of sensible perception with rhetorical description . . an actual exhibition of what lay within the boundary of vision, and an enumeration of the kingdoms which in different directions lay beyond it, with a glowing representation of their wealth and power (*and the glory of them*)."—P. S.]

only shalt thou serve." The devil is expressly designated as **Satan,** because in this temptation he displayed his real character as *the adversary* of Christ. Lastly, the answer of the Lord conveys the expression of His enmity to all that is satanic in the world, and to the carnal hopes and views entertained about the Messiah. It is, so to speak, a declaration of war on the part of Jesus against Satan, and that on account of the daring promise to make Jesus Lord of the world if He only submitted to his conditions. "Tentatorem, quum is maxime *favere* videri vult, Satanam appellat."—Bengel.

In looking back on this *threefold* temptation, we conclude that Satan *offered* to the Lord immediate possession of His Messianic inheritance on condition of His employing satanic agency, in the form of magic, of false religious enthusiasm or fanaticism, and of false and demoniacal worship. His first proposal was to confer on Jesus the office of a magician-prophet; his second, to make Him the chief and prince of a grand hierarchy; his third, to invest him with the office of demoniacal and all-powerful monarch of the world. But, manifestly, these were the three great traits of the carnal and perverse expectations which Israel entertained concerning the Messiah: the first temptation representing more especially the erroneous tendency of the Essenes, who lived in the wilderness; the second, the spurious religion of the Pharisees, whose centre was the temple service; and the third, the godless policy of the Sadducees, whose ruling passion was worldliness. The common psychological applications of this narrative—such as, that the first temptation was to sensual enjoyment, the second to fanatical pride, and the third to ambition—do not exhaust the deep bearing of the event, although they are implied in the interpretation above proposed.

The following is the *chronological* order of events: 1. The baptism of Jesus. 2. The forty days' fasting. 3. The deputation to John the Baptist from Jerusalem (John i.). 4. The temptation of Jesus. 5. The return of Jesus to John by the banks of Jordan (John i. 35). 6. His return to Galilee (ver. 43).

Ver. 11. *The victory.*—The triumph of the Saviour appears in these two facts: **The devil leaveth Him; angels** come and **minister unto Him,** thus paying Him real homage, διηκόνουν αὐτῷ. Bengel: "*Sine dubio pro eo, ac tum opus erat, sc. allato cibo* [undoubtedly, by doing that which was then necessary, namely, by bringing Him food]. Comp. the feeding of Elijah by an angel, 1 Kings xix. 5." Thus Piscator, Wolf, and many others,—among thèm, Meyer. Others understand the expression as denoting supernatural Divine support (Maldonatus, Kuinoel, Olshausen, Kuhn, Ammon, Ebrard). It deserves notice, that most critics who at present defend the view that the text implies a miraculous supply of food by the ministry of angels, characterize the whole narrative as a mere myth. When Jesus had undergone these temptations, He returned from the wilderness into the company of men. Hence any such miraculous supply of food for the body by angels would have been unnecessary. In our view of the passage, the Lord having conquered Satan, and established His glorious supremacy, not only over man, but also over the spiritual world, now entered into converse with ministering angels (John i. 51), realizing in the supernatural and heavenly support which He now enjoyed, in the fullest sense, His own declaration, that man lives not by bread alone.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The narrative before us establishes, in our opinion, two facts—that Jesus *could be tempted*, or the possibility of His falling; and again, that *He was tempted, yet without sin.* This threefold victory of His sinless soul marks another stage in the Gospel history. Before that, the God-man had, in the free exercise of His will, risen to full and joyous consciousness of His character and mission; now this consciousness became a settled divine-human mind or disposition over against all temptations and allurements of the world. From His first and decisive conflict with evil, which ever and again tempted Him during the three years of his earthly ministry, He came forth victorious to rear His kingdom on a spiritual and eternal foundation.

2. Solemn celebration in the wilderness of His full attainment to consciousness of His character and vocation, victory over the temptations of Satan, and maturing of the plan for His work—such are the three great phases in the preceding narrative, none of which can be separated from the other.

The first of these three phases was that of solemn celebration. Bearing in mind that Jesus was led into the wilderness by the Spirit, we infer that He went up in the full and deep consciousness of His vocation as the God-man. Heaven had been opened over Him the wings of the blessed Spirit had been upon and around Him. He had the testimony of His Sonship, and of the delight of the Father in Him. In the blessed enjoyment of these glorious realities, forty days passed without His feeling the common wants of humanity. But Jesus did not shut up within His own breast this His "being equal with God," as if it had been robbery (Phil. ii.),—least of all when He had just submitted to that baptism, in which, while humbling Himself to become the companion in sorrow of sinners, He had also attained the full consciousness of His theanthropy. Hence the solemn inward feast celebrated in the wilderness served as preparation for His work: the fulness of the Spirit, the fulness of love, the fulness of life within His soul—all summoned Him to be the Deliverer of His people and the Saviour of the world, even as the Father had called Him by His baptism and by the Holy Ghost; and in the depth of His sympathy with humanity, He heard not only His own people but a fallen world entreating deliverance.

But this very cry of the world contained a shrill discord which constituted His temptation. With infinite longing Israel waited for the advent of Messiah. But this glorious hope had become fearfully distorted in the false theology of the synagogue, in the ideas current among the people, in the hierarchical tendencies of the age, and in the general vanity of this world. Hence, while this longing for salvation in the inmost heart of humanity was a loud call for Jesus to reveal Himself to the world as the long-expected Redeemer, He was repelled by the false and unspiritual picture of the Messiah who was the object of the carnal hopes of Israel. The Holy One recognized in these perversions the agency of Satan. Thus far there could be neither doubt nor temptation. But that which in itself was evil had assumed a human form; it had been embodied in human representations, ideas, and aspirations; and in this its human form it made its appeal to His sympathies. This spurious and unholy Messianic expectation appeared most closely intertwined with the loftiest aspirations and the holiest hopes of humanity. It was

this seeming combination of two very different elements which might give rise to doubt and difficulty. The Saviour must now discern the spuriousness of this combination; and, to separate its heterogeneous elements, He had to overcome the temptation arising from the fanatical sympathies of His people and of the world. This constituted His temptation. Its point lay in the attractions of human sympathy, allurement, and entreaty; as also, in the apparent connection between what was perverse and what was holy. In His conflict with this temptation, it assumed a threefold form. In the first assault, the *Prophet*, in all the pride and self-sufficiency of a Magician, stands before His mind's eye; in the second, the *High Priest*, in all the pride and self-sufficiency of hierarchical pomp; and in the last, the *King*, in all the pride and self-sufficiency of secular policy and power. All these pictures are presented in their most attractive features, as painted in the bright anticipations of an expectant world, as drawn with all the cunning of Satan, and as reflecting in a distorted form His own person and vocation.

But He has overcome the threefold inward assault upon His soul (comp. the Gospel of Luke)—and the cravings of hunger indicate the weariness consequent upon this tremendous conflict. The victory which He has achieved in inward conflict, must now also appear in actual and historical incidents, and the outward temptations of Satan succeed His inward struggle.

This threefold historical victory of the Lord over the tempter also marks the grand scheme on which His work as the Saviour of the world was to be carried on. In opposition to the false principle of the world, He clearly realized the truth; in opposition to the spurious plans of Messiah's kingdom cherished by the world, He chose what was spiritual; in opposition to the false ideas entertained about the work of salvation, He manifested Himself as the true Prophet, Priest, and King. To reject the spurious plans of the synagogue, was at the same time to adopt the true scheme of His mission. Modern [German evangelical] theology commenced with a more full appreciation of the human nature [and sinless perfection] of Jesus, and first spoke of His plan or design. Thus Reinhard has written a work on the Plan of Jesus; Ullmann has rejected the idea of any such scheme, but Neander has vindicated its higher bearing. If by the expression, "plan," or "scheme," we mean that the Saviour was distinctly conscious of the principle, the development, the means and the goal of His work, the Lord had undoubtedly a matured "plan." But it was the leading characteristic of this plan, that it rejected and eliminated all that was merely external, every secular calculation; and that, in unfolding its own glorious properties and spiritual phases, it proved mainly a negation of all the chiliastic schemes of the synagogue. One of its principal features consisted in this, that while these spurious pictures of the Messiah presented a Saviour who was such in name and appearance only, Jesus would manifest the character and the works of the true Messiah, and that He would avoid even he designation of Messiah, until by His working He had redeemed and purified its idea, which had been so fatally perverted (comp. the "*Leben Jesu*," ii. 1, p. 231). Then Jesus chose the path of suffering instead of that of joy; humiliation unto obedience, instead of glory by self-exaltation. Hence, when at the close of His course the accuser tempted Him to despair, amidst the sorrows and under the burden of a guilty world, the Redeemer once more conquered, and entered upon the path of glory. Indeed, the most difficult part of His work was accomplished at the outset of His mission, when, in the power of the Spirit, He overcame Satan and the satanic temptation, connected with the spurious messianic expectations. He conquered Satan *as the tempter* in all the temptations of worldly allurement. Thus was the kingdom of darkness shaken in its inmost principle. This threefold victory unfolded and appeared in His ministry upon earth; and His triumph over the temptations of allurement, or over the tempter, in the strictest sense of the term, formed the prelude to His victory over the temptations of sorrow and suffering, or over the accuser, which awaited Him at the close of His course.

Thus the history of Christ's temptation is of infinite import. The destruction of the foundations on which rested the kingdom of darkness, and the structure of the basis on which the salvation of man was reared, are connected with the mystery of those solitary conflicts which had been fought and gained before He entered on the discharge of His public ministry.

3. The following contrasts are significant for christology. The first Adam in paradise, Christ in the wilderness.—Moses (Ex. xxxiv. 28; Deut. ix. 9, 18) and Elijah (1 Kings xix. 8) in the wilderness, Christ in the wilderness.—The fasting of John, the fasting of Christ.—The magic of the world, the prophetic office of Christ.—The hierarchy of the world, the priesthood of Christ.—The political despotism of the world, and the kingdom of Christ.—Essenism and Christ.—Pharisæism and Christ.—Sadduceism and Christ.—Chiliastic tradition and perversion of Scripture by Satan; the word of God, and ever only the word of God, as adduced by Christ.—Christ in the wilderness tempted by the allurements of the world.—Christ in the garden tempted by the sorrow and burden of the world.—The tempter at the commencement of the public ministry of Jesus; the accuser at the close of it.—The offers of Satan, and the triumph of Christ and its results.

4. The symbolical import of the number 40 lies in this, that it contains multiples of ten and four:—ten is the perfect number for life, law, and freedom; four is the number for the full circle of the world. During these forty days, Christ, by the free act of his will, *really* overcame the world and the spirit of the world, even as Moses had done *typically*.*

5. As it was fitting that Christ should commence His work by conquering Satan, so also was it in keeping with the tendency of evil to overturn the kingdom of God first of all in its Founder—and that by means of pretended but false friendship.

6. By His victory over the tempter, Christ has for ever separated His kingdom from the demoniac principles, plans, and manifestations of Jewish and carnal Christian chiliasm.

7. The first consequence of Christ's threefold renunciation of the world in His victory over Satan, was, that He betook himself to Galilee.

* [Here the Edinb. trsl., misled by a strange error of the first edition of the original, substitutes twice the number *seven* for *ten*, *the work of God* for *life*, *law* and *freedom*, *world and time* (*Weltzeit*) for *orb* or *circle of the world* (*Weltkreis*), etc., and thus obscures or perverts the sense of the passage completely. Dr. Lange anticipated the correction of the later editions of Matt. in the preface to the first edition of his Com. on Mark.—P. S.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Seasons of great quickening and joy are generally followed by great temptations. 1. This appears from the history of Abraham, of David, of Peter, and of the Lord. 2. The reason of this is, that the Lord would lead His own to perfection from stage to stage.—Christ's festive season a fast, and Christ's fasting a festive season.—From His festive celebration as the Son of God, Jesus as the Son of man enters immediately into conflict, in order to prove the truth of the testimony concerning His Divine Sonship.—The temptation of Christ, a manifestation by historical facts of the choice and decision of which His baptism was the sacramental sign.—By his threefold temptation and victory, Christ manifests Himself as the victorious Messiah, or the Christ of God: 1. as the infallible Prophet; 2. as the faithful High Priest; 3. as the Supreme King.—The decisive conflict between the fulness of the Spirit in Christ and the appearance of spirituality in Satan.—The Holy Ghost leads the Lord to this decisive conflict with the devil.—Christ attacking human corruption at its root by conquering Satan.—The victory of Christ the preservation of Christians.—The threefold temptation and the threefold victory of the Lord.—How and in what manner our trials may become temptations of Satan.—Every temptation of Satan is, to the child of God, in reality a trial of faith.—What constitutes temptation is, that through the influence of the enemy we misunderstand and misinterpret the trial of our faith.—Temptation assails us through earthly instrumentality: more especially, 1. through our wants; 2. through spiritual delusions; 3. through worldly prospects and hopes.—How victory over one may become the occasion of another temptation.—How our first victory opens the prospect of the triumphs to follow.—Our temptations are *numbered*.—By the word of God, Christ triumphs even over the chiliastic traditions connected with the word of God.—Christ ever and again conquers by the word of God: 1. by His first quotation, over false doctrine; 2. by His second quotation, over a false interpretation of Scripture; 3. by His third quotation, over false and assumed authority.—The power of this saying: "*It is written.*"

The first temptation. Christ has undergone for us the temptation of human want and suffering.—Let not the contrast between our spiritual high estate and our outward circumstances become a snare to us.—According both to the Old and the New Testament, temptation commences with doubt.—The tempter in the form of an angel of light.—Temptation to distrustfulness.—Magic and miracles.—The magician and the prophet.—Miraculous sustenance and magical sustenance* are two different things.—The magical manna [das Zauberbrod] which the world prepares for itself in its wilderness. 1. Its origin: (*a*) by wicked devices; (*b*) by wicked works. 2. Its apparent character: (*a*) boundless wealth; (*b*) boundless enjoyment. 3. Its real character; (*a*) guilt; (*b*) bankruptcy.† 4. Its final consequences: (*a*) poverty and want of the inner man; (*b*) poverty and want of the outer man.—He who would selfishly seek to convert stone into bread, will in reality convert even bread into stone.—Satan watches for the distress of man, to make it an occasion for transforming him into a beast of prey and a wicked spirit.—Such is the high calling of man, that he lives not by bread only.—Whoso depends on the mouth of God, his mouth shall not want food.—The judgment of Satan and that of Christ concerning man, in his want and distress. Satan in effect says: Man is a wretched being, suffering hunger; Christ says: So far as the real life of man is concerned, he is infinitely exalted above the mere animal cravings of hunger.—Christ would rather suffer hunger with man, than commit sin with supernatural spirits.—Trust in God ensures victory over the wants of the world.—The empty phrase of Satan rebutted by the simple word of Christ.—The bread of earth becomes transformed by the bread of heaven.—Christ has also conquered spurious anchoresism and asceticism.

The second temptation. The holiest things may be perverted to become the most vile temptation: 1. A stay in the holy city. 2. The prospect from the pinnacle of the temple. 3. The promise contained in an inspired psalm.—The victory of the Lord over religious fanaticism.—Destruction of the temple of spurious enthusiasm.—Victory of the great High Priest over the priestcraft of the world.—Christ and the show-miracles of the hierarchy.—The pomp of the temple, and worship in the spirit.—The giddy height on the pinnacle of the temple and the holy calm of the Lord.—Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God; for, 1. to tempt God is to impute evil to God Himself, since it is an attempt to drag Him into the ways of our own choosing; 2. to tempt God is to suffer oneself to be tempted by the evil one; 3. hence, to tempt God were to attempt rendering the Spirit of light subservient to the spirit of darkness.—To tempt God is to involve oneself in contradictions; for it implies, 1. faith without obedience; 2. prayer without self-surrender; 3. action without warrant from on high; 4. success without comfort or assurance.—Even the dictates of common sense may serve as a warning against fanaticism.—Where a way is already prepared, we are not warranted in attempting to make dangerous experiments for ourselves.—Pride goes before a fall.—The temple-stair itself a sermon.—Fanaticism mistakes excitement for spiritual emotion.—Fanaticism and priestly pretensions spring from one and the same religious delusion.—Christ vanquishes the fanatical pride of the priesthood by calm reverence for the Godhead.

The third temptation. Christ vanquishes the secular spirit of the world: 1. in its pomp; 2. in its pretensions; 3. in its cunning and deceit.—The kingdom of Christ as contrasted with those of the world.—When Satan offers to give away the world in exchange for an act of humble adoration, he shows himself to be, 1. a liar; 2. a deceiver; 3. a maligner of God and man.—The attractions of power, and the desire of exercising it absolutely and indiscriminately, are the two greatest temptations.—Satan has only the right of claiming as his own the worldliness of the world: 1. its vain show; 2. its guilt; 3. its despair.—Despotism and spurious worldly cunning, and their dark background.—When wickedness shows itself undisguised, we ought to designate it by its proper name.—Christians must meet every spurious claim to authority over their consciences, by an appeal to the word of Him who wields rightful authority over the conscience.—Daring usurpers will at last be met and confounded by the royal dignity and

* ["*Wunderbrod* und *Zauberbrod*,"—literally: *wonder-bread* and *magic bread*. The sense is plain enough. But the term admits of a wide application. Not only magicians, sorcerers and soothsayers, but all those who live of dishonest gain and humbug, may be said to eat *Zauberbrod*.—P. S.]

† [*Schuld*; *Schulden*,—literally: *guilt*; *debts*. The Edb. trsl. has *difficulties*, which is too general.—P. S.]

authority which belongs even to the humblest believer.—By serving God, Christ vanquishes the sinful service of the creature.—"Him only shalt thou serve."—Resist the devil, and he will flee from you.—The ministry of angels after the assault of the devil.—Christ the Prince of angels, by his victory over the prince of the kingdom of darkness.—The greater the conflict, the more glorious the victory.—In all temptations Christ is our victory.

Starke:—We must prepare in retirement for important public undertakings.—God often permits His dear children to be visited by the most grievous temptations.—Solitude a training-school of the Holy Spirit.—Solitude is frequently the occasion of temptation.—In our temptations, let us ever distinguish between what comes from God and what from Satan.—Such a High Priest became us who was tempted in all things, Heb. iv. 15.—Frequent conflicts render the Christian strong.—They fit ministers for their work.—*Oratio, meditatio, tentatio faciunt theologum.*—We may readily recognise the bird of hell by its song.—Fasting as perverted by the Papacy, etc.—Moderation and temperance a continuous fasting.—Christ hungered because He partook of our infirmities.—Christ can have compassion on us when we suffer from hunger or thirst.—The devil adapts his temptations to the nature and circumstances of man.—If the devil ventured to approach the Son of God, how can the most advanced among us expect to be secure from his assaults?—Outward prosperity is not an evidence of sonship.—The word of God our armory.—Even the devil cannot set aside the Scriptures.*—All depends on the blessing which the Lord gives.—Outward means cannot sustain us, but God by outward means.—God is a supply which never fails or leaves unsatisfied.—If Satan does not succeed in one way, he will try another.—In his own way, the devil is learned in the Scriptures.—To pervert Scripture is to follow in the wake of the devil.—Satan fell by his pride and arrogance, and now seeks to ruin others in the same manner.—To expose oneself to danger, except in the way of our calling, from necessity, or with the direct warrant of the word, is presumption.—Satan encompasses the fall of carnal men by showing them even a small portion of this world.—Satan promises his servants what he himself does not possess, nay, what God has in Christ already promised and given to His own.—It is not right to hear blasphemy without reproving it.—He who would prevent us from serving God, and persuade us to serve the world, is Satan so far as we are concerned.—There is a "hitherto and no further" in every temptation.—Every honest conflict will certainly be followed by victory.—Christ has triumphed for us.

Gerlach:—The word of God is our armor against Satan.—Christ takes as His shield the law of God: *Thou shalt!* He was made under the law (Gal. iv. 4).

Heubner:—If solitude has its advantages, it has also its great dangers.—Satan appears here in his true character: he arrogates to himself what belongs to God alone—dominion over the soul; in short, he claims to be God.—The man who in his aims is actuated by ambition and love of power, is thereby rendered unfit for the service of God; yet how many theologians are impelled by such motives!—The temptation of Christ; 1. wherein it consisted, and how it was resisted (three stages, three victories); 2. its consequences: Jesus proving Himself to be the Holy One; Jesus our model in similar conflicts; Jesus our refuge and strength.—How temptations followed Christ throughout His course.—The impotence of all temptations in the case of Christ.—Comparison between the temptation of Christ and that of Adam.—*Marheineke:*—How closely good and evil border upon each other in our human nature!—*Harms:*—The conflict between good and evil. This conflict is threefold: 1. A conflict between doubt and trustfulness; 2. a conflict between presumption and modesty; 3. the conflict between the lust of the world and the love of God.—*Schleiermacher:*—The temptation of the Lord viewed with reference to our state and position in this world.—*Bachmann:*—The temptation of Jesus the Son of God in the wilderness. It was a temptation, 1. to doubt the word of God; 2. to presume upon the word of God; 3. to reject the word of God.—*Greiling:*—The three passions by which men are commonly tempted to sin (covetousness, pride, ambition).—*Reinhard:*—The decisive periods which commonly occur in the life of every man.—*Ahlfeld:*—The conflict of Christians with the tempter: 1. His attack; 2. their defence; 3. the victory.—(Comp. also Three Sermons on the *History of the Temptation* by J. P. Lange, Barmen, 1836. Brückner: *The History of the Temptation of our Lord.* Four Meditations. Leipzig, 1857.)

* [Comp. Shakspeare, *Merchant of Venice*, Act I., Scene 3, where Antonio says to Bassanio:

"The devil can cite Scripture for his purpose.
An evil soul, producing holy witness,
Is like a villain with a smiling cheek;
A goodly apple rotten at the heart;
O, what a goodly outside falsehood hath!"—P. S.]

B. Chapter IV. 12-17.

Contents:—First appearance of Jesus as the light of the world amidst the darkness of the land of Galilee.

12 Now, when Jesus had heard that John was cast into prison, [delivered up,[1]] he de-
13 parted into Galilee[2]; And leaving Nazareth, he came and dwelt in Capernaum, which is
14 upon the sea coast, in the borders of Zabulon and Nephthalim[3]: That it might be ful-
15 filled which was spoken by Esaias [Isaiah] the prophet, saying, The land of Zabulon,
and the land of Nephthalim, *by* the way of the sea, beyond [the] Jordan, Galilee of the
16 Gentiles; The people which sat in darkness saw great light; and to them which sat
in the region and shadow of death light is sprung up.

17 From that time Jesus began to preach, and to say, Repent: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.

[1] Ver. 12.—[παρεδόθη, Lange: *überliefert*. Wicl., Tynd., Cranm., Geneva: *was taken*; the Bishop's Bible (and the Rom. Cath. Vers. of Rheims) correctly: *delivered up*, with the marginal explanation: "*that is, cast into prison*," which the Auth. Vers. received into the text, while it put the translation into the margin, influenced perhaps (as Dr. Conant suggests) by Beza's version: *traditum esse in custodiam*, and his note: *id est, in carcerem conjectum esse*.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 12.—Galilee proper in the narrower sense of the term.

[3] Ver. 13.—[Or: *Zebulun* and *Naphtali*, after the Hebrew spelling, which is followed by the Auth. Vers. in the Old Test. *See* the Hebrew concordances.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 12. **Now, when Jesus had heard.**—The Evangelist passes over a number of intervening events, viz.: 1. the return of Jesus to Galilee (John i. 41, etc.); 2. the marriage in Cana, the journey to Capernaum in company with His relatives and disciples, and that to Jerusalem to the passover (John ii.); 3. the stay of Jesus at Jerusalem and in the land of Judæa *previous* to the imprisonment of John (John iii.); 4. the return of Jesus by way of Samaria, and His stay there (John iv. 1–42).—The event recorded in the text took place at the time referred to in John iv. 43–46. In the passage before us, Matthew briefly alludes to the stay of Jesus at Nazareth,—the same which is mentioned Luke iv. 14 sqq.,—but dilates on it more fully in ch. xiii. 53. We account for this transposition from the peculiar structure of the Gospel,—the object of the Evangelist being to group events so as to present a continuous narrative. The actual succession of events is more accurately indicated in the Gospel by Luke, although it also contains no mention of the first passover which Jesus attended at Jerusalem, nor of His stay in Judæa and Samaria. From the narrative of Luke we learn that Jesus was even at that time rejected by the people of Nazareth, and that he then uttered the saying, that "a prophet had no honor in his own country." But, according to John, Jesus spoke these words when returning from Jerusalem to Galilee through Samaria. Commentators have felt a difficulty in explaining the circumstance, that (according to John) Jesus should have been saying that "a prophet had no honor in his own country," at the very time when He was on His journey to Galilee. It might seem that such a statement would rather imply His departure from Galilee. But the difficulty is removed by recalling to mind the precise geographical arrangements of the country. In John iv. 43, the Evangelist uses the word Galilee not in the general sense, but as a man familiar with the district would apply the term—a circumstance which may be regarded as an indirect evidence of the truthfulness of his narrative. What he calls Galilee is not the province in question as contradistinguished from Judæa, but the district of Upper Galilee in opposition to Lower Galilee, in which Nazareth was situate. The boundary-line between Upper and Lower Galilee ran due east and west between Nazareth and Cana. In John iv. 43, 44, the Evangelist makes only a passing allusion to the rejection of Jesus at Nazareth, and dwells in preference on the fact, that the Saviour was gladly received by the inhabitants of Galilee proper. From what we have said, it will be clear that the accounts of Matthew and John are not inconsistent, as Meyer imagines; although that commentator is right in maintaining, against Wieseler, that the passage in the text does not refer to the journey to Galilee recorded in John vi. 1. Finally, we gather from the account in Matthew that the imprisonment of John by Antipas took place some time after the celebration of the first passover which Jesus attended, and after His stay in Judæa.

That John was delivered up, (*i. e.* into prison).—The ground on which the Baptist was imprisoned is afterwards recorded, on the occasion of his execution (xiv. 4). Fritzsche supposes that the imprisonment of John induced Jesus to appear in Galilee, lest the people of that country should be deprived of spiritual support; while Meyer regards this event as a motive for His retirement to that province, since "the more remote district of Galilee, although under the rule of Herod Antipas, would naturally attract less attention, and thus afford shelter." But although Capernaum lay in Upper Galilee, yet, from its proximity to Tiberias—the residence of Herod—and the intercourse between these two places, both situate on the Lake of Galilee, anything which occurred in Capernaum would much more readily attract attention than what took place in Nazareth, which lay out of the way among the mountains. Besides, it was at this very time that Jesus commenced His public ministry, and called disciples around Him. The connection between the imprisonment of John and the appearance of Jesus in "Galilee of the Gentiles," as well as the cessation of the preparatory baptism which the disciples of Jesus had for a time administered (John iv. 1, 2,) may readily be otherwise explained. The imprisonment of John, and the tame acquiescence of the country in this act, had put an end to the hope of preparing the people for the kingdom of Messiah by Levitical purifications, or legal purity. Now that the attempt at outward purity had been thus rudely stopped, Jesus might, in the consciousness of His own inward and eternal purity, all the more readily commence His work in Galilee of the Gentiles, amidst publicans and sinners, by gathering around Him a circle of disciples.

Ver. 13. **He came and dwelt in Capernaum.**—Καφαρναούμ, כְּפַר נַחוּם, meaning, according to Hesychius, Origen, and Jerome, *vicus consolationis*, but according to others (Winer, Meyer), the village of Nahum. The town lay on the borders of the tribes of Zebulun and Naphtali, on the western shore of the Lake of Gennesareth, probably near where the Jordan entered that lake. It was a thriving commercial place, on the road from Damascus to the Mediterranean. Capernaum was inhabited both by Jews and Gentiles; in Jewish writings it is characterized as the residence of heretics and free-thinkers (von Ammon, "*Leben Jesu*," p. 359). The contrast between Capernaum, where Jesus dwelt, and Tiberias, the residence of Antipas—a city which the Lord uniformly avoided, but which, after the destruction of Jerusalem, became one of the holy places of the Jews,*—is striking. But the prediction of Christ in

* [The rise of Tiberias, as a *Jewish* city, is, however, of much later date. For an account of the circumstances connected with its final "Levitical purification," *see* Edersheim's *Hist. of the Jewish Nation*, p. 458.—The Edinb. Tr.]

regard to Capernaum, once so highly favored, has been most signally and literally fulfilled (Matt. xi. 23). At this moment every trace of the site of Capernaum has disappeared. Wilson and others regard the ruins of *Tell Hum* (i. e. Nahum) as the ancient site of Capernaum. As the town is not mentioned in the Old Testament, it seems probable that it was built after the return from the Babylonish exile. Josephus (*Vita*, 72) calls the town Καφαρνώμη. In another place (*De Bello Jud.* iii. 10, 8) he assigns the name of Καφαρναούμ to a fountain in Galilee. According to Robinson, this fountain is the modern *'Ain et Tin*, by the Lake of Gennesareth, near the Khan Minyeh, which he regards as the site of ancient Capernaum. But this opinion is not generally entertained. Comp. the art. *Capernaum* in the Bibl. Encycls.

Vers. 14 and 15. **That it might be fulfilled.**—In this instance we have the fulfilment of a verbal prophecy, the passages in Isa. viii. 22; ix. 1, 2, being strictly Messianic in their primary meaning, although the prophet seems also to have had in view the oppression of the Assyrians, under which at that time Northern Palestine groaned. But, as in every other similar instance, the event recorded in ver. 13 did not take place simply on account of this prediction, but on independent grounds. The passage is cited freely from the original Hebrew: "At the first (in ancient times) He brought to shame the land of Zebulun and the land of Naphtali; but afterward (in later times) He brought to honor the (despised) way of the sea, beyond Jordan, the *circuit* (Galilee) of the Gentiles. The people that walked in darkness have seen a great light; and they that dwell in the land of the shadow of death, upon them hath the light shined." In the quotation as given by Matthew, the despised district is even more pointedly indicated as the land of Zabulon and the land of Nephthalim, **the way of the sea** (the road by the sea, or the great road of the traffic of the world), the **beyond Jordan,** (even) **Galilee of the Gentiles.** In our opinion, the Sea of Galilee was not so important a highway for the traffic of the ancient world as to give to the district around the designation of "the way of the sea," more especially as the three expressions in the text are not intended to designate three different objects, but one and the same thing viewed under different aspects. In the first clause, Galilee is designated as profane, being the way of the sea for all the world; in the second clause, as extending northward beyond the sources of Jordan, the holy river; finally, in the third clause, as being really a heathen district, largely inhabited by Gentiles. But the expression γῆ, without the article, may be regarded as the nominative. Before ὁδὸν θαλάσσης we must again supply the γῆ of the former clause,—toward the sea, or the way of the sea. The absolute accusative ὁδὸν is a Hebraistic form like דֶּרֶךְ, and equivalent to the Latin *versus* (comp. Meyer, p. 111). The expression πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου cannot in this instance mean Peræa, or the country east of Jordan. A reference to that district would be here quite out of place, as the name "Galilee of the Gentiles" is intended again to designate the tribes of Naphtali and Zebulun. The territory of Naphtali extended northward beyond the source of the Jordan; and from a theocratic point of view, this, and not Peræa, would constitute the πέραν τ. Ἰ., although that expression was commonly applied to Peræa. Besides, Peræa was not the first scene of Christ's ministry. Meyer, indeed, maintains that the Evangelist overlooked the historical meaning of the passage in Isaiah, which was only Messianic in a theocratic and political sense, referring to the deliverance of Northern Galilee from the oppression of the Assyrians. But this commentator forgets that Isa. ix. 1 sqq. is a strictly Messianic prediction, although it rests, of course, on the historical basis of the age of the prophet.

Ver. 16. **The people which sat in darkness.**—Apposition to the preceding designation of the locality which was to be illuminated by the light of the Messiah. The darkness of the country is explained by the sad spiritual state of the people. In view of the spiritual condition of the people at the time, the Evangelist modifies the distinction made by Isaiah between those that *walk* in darkness, who *see a great light*, and those that dwell or sit in the land of the shadow of death. In the passage as quoted by Matthew, the state of matters has apparently become worse than in the days of Isaiah, and even those who formerly "walked" are now represented as "sitting" in darkness. But the gradation of the original is retained; and we have still the contrast between those who sit in darkness and see a great light, and those who sit in the region and shadow of death, and only become aware of the light because it has sprung up for them. In the Hebrew *their passiveness* is even more strongly expressed—נָגַהּ עֲלֵיהֶם, *upon them* light hath shined. "Καθήμενος sedendi verbum aptum notandæ solitudini inerti,"—(the verb *to sit* aptly denotes a sluggish solitude).—Bengel. Σκιὰ θανάτου, צַלְמָוֶת, *tenebræ mortis*. On the darkness of *Sheol*, comp. Job x. 21, etc.

Ver. 17. **From that time Jesus began.**—Matthew calls attention to the circumstance, that with the settlement of Jesus at Capernaum, in Upper Galilee, a new period in His public ministry began. The κηρύσσειν of the kingdom of heaven in the strictest sense now commenced, and for this purpose He set apart some of His disciples to be His Apostles. The call, **Repent,** μετανοεῖτε, has now a higher meaning than when first uttered by John the Baptist (ch. iii. 2), and a more full manifestation of His miraculous power proves that **the kingdom of heaven is really at hand.** Although He does not designate Himself to the people as the Messiah, yet the kingdom of Messiah was appearing. From the manifestation of that kingdom now vouchsafed, the people are to recognise the Prince of Peace in His true and New Testament character. (The assertion of Strauss, that Jesus had not regarded Himself at first as the Messiah, requires no special answer; the suggestion, that Christ gradually changed His original plan, has been discarded even by the writer who proposed it.)

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. As John carried on his public ministry at the extreme boundary of the Holy Land, in the wilderness, so Jesus also appeared first at another extreme limit of the country, in Upper Galilee. Capernaum became His earthly residence. This choice had a twofold advantage. For while He thereby gave a practical denial to the carnal Messianic hopes and expectations of the people of Judæa, He also occupied a field most suitable for His own peculiar activity. There He found the greatest susceptibility for the kingdom, and readiness to receive Him, especially among those retired worshippers of Jeho-

vah who lived by the Lake of Galilee, and particularly among the disciples of John, whom He had already attracted around Him. This residence of the Saviour in Galilee had been predicted, and was a signal fulfilment of the great Messianic prophecy of Isaiah. Lastly, His abode among the fishermen of Galilee was in complete harmony with what His baptism and the victory over the tempter implied; being, in truth, a perfect renunciation of the world in reference to its carnal views concerning the theocracy and the Messiah.

2. But we may also regard this as a manifestation of His Spirit and of His Gospel. Just as He commenced His destruction of the kingdom of darkness, by conquering the power of Satan in his chief temptations, so He commenced the building up of the kingdom of heaven among the most despised portion of His people, the most needy and the most destitute of the means which the synagogue provided for cultivating spiritual life. It was among these that the Saviour first publicly and unreservedly proclaimed the kingdom of heaven.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Complete renunciation of the world on the part of the Lord is followed by His full proclamation of the kingdom of heaven.—When the kingdom of heaven arrives, the symbolical administration of priests is at an end.—When the work of John ceases, that of Christ begins.—The kingdom of God will never want messengers of God who stand in the gap.—If one prophet is imprisoned, a greater one will be sent in his place. If they burn the goose, a swan will arise from its ashes.*—Jesus a stranger both at Nazareth, where His youthful years were spent, and at Capernaum, where He appeared after attaining to manhood.—Obscurity of that which is holy in its own home, showing: 1. The corruption of the world; 2. the spiritual glory of the heavenly life.—The light of salvation rising upon dark places: 1. Upon the earth, in opposition to the external heavens; 2. upon Galilee, in opposition to the land of Judæa; 3. upon the Gentile world, in opposition to the Jews; 4. upon the despised Germanic races, in opposition to the ancient Romanic Church.—The land of the shadow of death: 1. The home of sinners; 2. the heart of the sinner.—The difference between those who see a great light, and those upon whom a great light rises. 1. The former look upwards, the latter look downwards. 2. The former descry the star of salvation, the latter only the light which it sheds.—**From that time Jesus began.** The ancient theocratic institutions of Israel may be said to have been abrogated when John was cast into prison.—The call to repentance, from the commencement to the end of the world, 1. always the same in substance; 2. always different in form.—The kingdom of heaven is as closely at hand as Christ is.—The call: Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand. 1. It contains *two* things: (*a*) the kingdom of heaven is at hand; (*b*) therefore repent. 2. It may be summed up in the expression, "kingdom of heaven;" for, (*a*) repentance is only the gate to the kingdom of heaven; (*b*) the kingdom of heaven is the grand object and goal of repentance.—In His humiliation, Christ has manifested His exaltation. 1. Rejected on earth, He opened up His kingdom of heaven. 2. Obscure and unknown by man, He revealed the spiritual world in all its blessedness. 3. Renouncing all, He bestows every blessing.

Starke:—Let us show holy obedience in being ready to change our habitation when the Lord calls.—Many live under the full blaze of the Gospel as if they still sat in the shadow of death.—When the world silences one honored servant of the Lord, God raises up others; the Church shall never be left destitute of them.—Repentance without faith is no repentance (and faith without repentance is no faith).—Agreement subsisting between all pure teachers of the Church (John and Jesus).

Heubner:—It is God's method to cause light to arise from humble and despised places.—Jesus would not be far distant even from the Gentiles.

* [This sentence: "*Verbrennen sie die Gans, so kommt der Schwan*," which Dr. Edersheim omitted, is an allusion to an apocryphal prophecy ascribed to the reformer Hus, who was burnt at the stake for heresy, July 6, 1415, by order of the Council of Constance, and is said to have uttered, in his last hour, the words: "*To-day you roast a goose*,"—alluding to his name which is the Bohemian word for *goose*—"*but from mine ashes will arise a swan*"—the armorial device of Luther—"*whom you will not be able to destroy.*" This prediction occurs first in the Latin works of Luther (Altenburg ed., vol. v., p. 599, etc.), and seems to have arisen in the age of the Reformation from certain vague and general sayings of Hus concerning the ultimate triumph of his doctrines (comp. Gieseler, *Kirchengeschichte*, vol. ii., Part IV., p. 417 sq.). The sentence has assumed a somewhat proverbial significance, although very rarely used.—P. S.]

C. CHAPTER IV. 18–22.

(*The Gospel for St. Andrew's Day.*)

CONTENTS:—In His obscurity and retirement from the world, which He had renounced, the Saviour commences the conquest of the world by calling four fishermen by the Sea of Galilee.

18 And Jesus, walking by the Sea of Galilee, saw two brethren, Simon called Peter,
19 and Andrew his brother, casting a net into the sea: for they were fishers. And he
20 said unto them, Follow me, and I will make you fishers of men. And they straight-
21 way left *their* nets, and followed him. And going on from thence, he saw other two
brethren, James *the son* of Zebedee, and John his brother, in a [the][1] ship with Zebedee
22 their father, mending their nets; and he called them. And they immediately left the
ship and their father, and followed him.

[1] Ver. 21.—[ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ. Tynd., Cranm., and the Bishop's Bible correctly: *in the ship*; Wicl., Gen., Auth. V., and Rheims: *in a ship*.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 18. **By the Sea of Galilee.**—Lake *Gennesaret*, λίμνη Γεννησαρέτ, Luke v. 1 (also Γεννησάρ, Γεννησαρῖτις, *Genesara*, יָם כִּנֶּרֶת); ἡ θάλασσα τῆς Τιβεριάδος, John xxi. 1; ἡ θαλ. τῆς Γαλιλαίας, Matt. xv. 29, etc. The lake, which is formed by the river Jordan, is about six hours, or 150 stadia long, and about half as broad [twelve or fourteen miles long, six or seven miles in breadth, and 165 feet deep.—P. S.]. The water is salubrious, fresh, and clear; it contains abundance of fish; the banks are picturesque, although at present bare; toward the west they are intersected by calcareous mountains,—toward the east the lake is bounded by high mountains (800 to 1,000 feet high), partly of chalk and partly of basalt formation. It is of an oval form, being a deep depression in an upland country (according to Schubert, its level is 535 feet below the Mediterranean).* Besides these remarkable natural features, the contrast between the present desolation of its shores and their flourishing state at the time of Jesus, when covered with cities and inhabited by a busy throng,—above all, the solemn remembrance of the Lord's labors, render it a most striking object. On the difference between the accounts of Schubert and of Robinson in regard to the beauty of the lake, comp. Winer, art. *Genezareth*. Recent travellers have furnished ample details of the district (comp. Josephus, *De Bello Jud.* iii. 10, 7).

Simon called Peter.—The designation *Peter* is given by way of historical anticipation. *Simon*, contracted from *Simeon*, שִׁמְעוֹן (hearing, favorable hearing). On the name *Peter*, comp. ch. xvi. 18.

Andrew.—A purely Greek name (*see* Winer *sub verbo*); which, however, also occurred among the Jews at a later period. Andrew and John were the earliest disciples of Jesus,—the first who joined the Saviour, following the direction of John the Baptist, whose disciples they had been (John i. 39). It is uncertain whether Andrew was the elder brother of Peter. His home was at Bethsaida (John i. 44). For further particulars about this disciple, see ch. x.

Casting a net into the sea.—The circumstance that they were just about to commence their daily labor, is mentioned for the purpose of bringing out the significancy of their instantly following Christ. The same remark applies to the narrative of the calling of the sons of Zebedee when preparing their nets.

Ver. 19. **Follow me.**—Meyer has again repeated the old objection, so frequently refuted, that this passage is incompatible with John i. 37, and with Luke v. 4. But John only refers to the first summoning of disciples, while here we have an account of their express call to follow the Lord, in the sense of becoming His servants and messengers. In Luke v. 4 we have the details of a scene connected with this calling. Wieseler rightly distinguishes, 1. between their preliminary call, implying discipleship in general and adoption of His cause, but without any special obligation, John i. 35 sqq.; 2. their selection as continuous and regular followers of the Lord, Matt. iv. 18 sqq. (also Luke v. 4); and 3. the choice of twelve to be Apostles, Matt. x. 2–4. These stages may also be arranged as follows: 1. Reception as disciples in the most general sense (catechumens); 2. selection for service, by continuous following of the Lord (Evangelists); 3. selection to be the representatives of the Lord, with bestowal of the power to work miracles (Apostles). The latter distinction was, however, bestowed upon the Apostles with certain conditions and limitations, until after the outpouring of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost (Acts ii. 4).

I will make you fishers of men.—The meaning evidently is, that by devotion, prudence, and perseverance, they were to gain souls for the kingdom of Christ from the sea of the world. Thus the imagery employed by the Saviour connects their former with their new vocation,—their secular employment serving as emblem of their spiritual calling. On the other hand, the words indicate the infinite superiority of the work to which they were now called.

Ver. 21. **James the son of Zebedee.**—From this passage it has rightly been inferred, that James was the elder brother of John. The sons of Zebedee, too, immediately relinquished their former occupation at the moment when they were about to resume it with fresh ardor. Another feature in their spiritual history is, that along with their nets, they are called to leave their father also. The narrative seems to imply that Zebedee gave his consent.

* [According to Lieut. Symonds it is 328, according to Lieut. Lynch 653 feet below the level of the Mediterranean. See the various Biblic. Dictionaries.—P. S.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. "The *sea* is the *emblem* of the world. The number *four* is the symbolic *number* of the world." The first step in the conquest of the world was taken when Jesus summoned these four Apostles to become fishers of men to all the world.

Christ's spiritual renunciation of the world forms the commencement of its spiritual conquest. This conquest is accomplished by the power of the kingdom of heaven, and for the kingdom of heaven of which Jesus has become the king by His renunciation of the world. Among these four disciples, Peter may be regarded as representing the foundation of the new church; James the elder (as James the younger at a later date) the government and preservation of the same. Upon Andrew it devolved to prepare the way of the Gospel, and its extension throughout the world; while John sounded the inmost depths of spiritual realities. In striking contrast with the practice sanctioned by corrupt traditionalism, the Lord chose as His instruments pious though unlearned fishermen, and not Rabbins. These humble men had, indeed, also their prejudices, which required to be overcome, but in vastly different measure from the learned of that age. It is therefore an entire mistake on the part of some older divines, to speak of the want of proper qualification and preparation in the disciples.

2. *Luther*:—"If the Gospel required the potentates of this world for its planting and preservation, God would not have committed it to fishermen."

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Christ's retirement by the Sea of Galilee the inauguration of the kingdom of heaven.—The commencement of the new era.—The Lord's walking His most glorious work.—The irresistible power of the call of Jesus in the hearts of the elect. 1. As inherent in the call itself. It is the irresistible power, (*a*) of the Redeemer, the God-Man; (*b*) of the Holy Spirit setting us free; (*c*) of blessed love; (*d*)

of supreme power guiding and directing us. 2. As springing from spiritual influence on the heart of the disciples: (*a*) The Father drawing them, (*b*) by the word of prophecy; (*c*) by their first converse with the Lord.—Only the call of the Lord can confer the ministerial office.—Faithfulness in a lower sphere is the condition and preparation for a higher.—The call of the Lord, **Follow me,** 1. an invitation to full communion with Him; 2. a demand of perfect self-renunciation for His sake; 3. an announcement of a new sphere of activity under Him; 4. a promise of rich reward from Him.—The call of Jesus to follow Him, 1. a call to faith; 2. a call to labor; 3. a call to suffering and cross-bearing; 4. a call to our blessed home.—How the Lord transforms our earthly calling into an emblem of our heavenly.—The work of apostleship under the simile of the art of fishing. 1. We must know the lake; 2. we must know how to allure; 3. we must be able patiently to wait; 4. we must be ready to hazard our lives; 5. we must cast out the net in confidence; 6. we must expect a draught.—The Divine character of the Church of Christ, as manifest in this, that it was founded by unlearned fishermen and publicans.—Christ manifesting Himself as the heavenly Master, in the selection of His first Apostles.—He who would follow the Lord, must be ready to leave all things.—The four Apostles, brethren after the flesh, and brethren in the kingdom of God. 1. A token how true brotherly feeling leads to the Lord; 2. how the highest brotherhood is that in the Lord; 3. how heavenly brotherhood sheds a halo around earthly relationship.—The four friends by the Lake of Galilee, or the blessing of true friendship. 1. It leads to seeking the Lord; 2. it springs from finding the Lord.—How the sovereignty of Christ over the world appears by His making four fishermen from the Sea of Galilee princes in the kingdom of God.—If we are to win others for the Lord, we ourselves must have been first won by Him.—The ideal perfectness of every art and vocation in Christ.—That which Christ teaches He also works in us.—The calling of the Apostles the commencement of a new creation.

Starke:—Jesus still chooses teachers for His work, nay, He has chosen them from all eternity.—Let none fancy that he can succeed by himself; even Christ chose assistants.—A minister must be called of God.—We must first follow Jesus ourselves before bringing others to Him.—Let us not only call each other brethren, but prove ourselves such.—He who would enter upon the ministry in the spirit of the Apostles, must be ready to renounce every human tie.

Heubner:—If Christ asks much, He also promises much.—The Apostles are our ensample how to follow Christ.

D. Chapter IV. 23–25.

Contents:—Jesus passing through Galilee like an ordinary Rabbi, but manifesting Himself as the Saviour of all nations.

23 And Jesus went about all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the
gospel[1] of the kingdom, and healing all manner of sickness, and all manner of disease,
24 among the people. And his fame went throughout all Syria: and they brought unto
him all sick people that were taken with divers diseases and torments, and those which
were possessed with devils, and those which were lunatic, and those that had the palsy;
25 and he healed them. And there followed him great multitudes of people from Galilee,
and *from* Decapolis, and *from* Jerusalem, and *from* Judea, and *from* beyond Jordan.

[1] Ver. 23.—[Lange likewise translates: *Das Evangelium*. I cannot agree with Dr. Conant and others who think that where εὐαγγέλιον occurs in its original literal sense, it should always be translated *good news*, or *glad tidings*, and that *gospel* should be retained only where the Greek has taken a later tropical sense. This change is unnecessary; for *gospel* (*God's spell*, or *good spell* = *good news*) is the old Saxon equivalent for the Gr. εὐαγγέλιον, and so universally understood. The E. V. always translates the noun εὐαγγέλιον *gospel* (in 77 passages), but renders the verb εὐαγγελίζειν sometimes *to preach the gospel*, sometimes *to bring* or *to declare glad tidings*. Comp. Luke i. 19; ii. 10; Acts xiii. 32; Rom. x. 15; 1 Thess. iii. 6.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 23. **And Jesus went about all Galilee.**—The term probably implies only Upper Galilee. The passage may, however, be regarded as giving a summary or general view of Christ's activity throughout Galilee. This activity formed part of His work in the various districts of Palestine, since Matthew also specially notes His labors in Peræa and Judæa. Galilee, in the more general sense of the term, formed the northernmost part of Palestine, being ten geographical miles long and four to five geographical miles broad, and bounded on the west by the sea and Phœnicia, on the north by Cœlesyria, on the east by the Jordan and the Lake of Tiberias, and on the south by Samaria, where in the west the brook Kishon, and farther east a line drawn from Mount Tabor to Scythopolis, and the promontory of Carmel, formed its boundary. Originally the name הַגָּלִיל (Josh. xx. 7, xxi. 32) was confined to the circuit of Upper Galilee; afterward the province was divided into Upper and Lower Galilee. The former was a mountainous country, the latter partly level. Upper Galilee extended from Beersheba to the village of Baca, and from the village of Thella, near Jordan, to Meroth. According to Strabo, it was partly inhabited by Gentiles (by Phœnicians, Syrians, Arabs; according to Joseph., *Vita*, xii., also by Greeks); hence the name, Galilee of the Gentiles. The district is

alpine, and of the chalk formation. Its mountains do not rise to any considerable height; the valleys are very romantic. Galilee was a most fertile country, equally adapted for agriculture and pasturage, besides having the lake within its district. Hence the large number of its inhabitants (Joseph., *De Bello Jud.* iii. 3, 1). It contained 404 towns and villages. The people of Galilee were brave, industrious, and intelligent; although the inhabitants of Judæa proper looked down upon them on account of their contact with the heathen and their uncouth dialect. For further particulars, comp. Winer [Kitto, W. Smith], and the works on the Holy Land.

Teaching in their synagogues.—The general sketch of Christ's sphere of activity is followed by a description of its peculiar mode. Conforming to Jewish custom, He appeared as a travelling Rabbi in the various synagogues of Galilee. The συναγωγή (from συνάγω, the *congregation*), in the Sept. for עֵדָה and קָהָל. The name embodied the idea that each synagogue represented the congregation of Israel as a whole, just as we designate each particular Christian community a church, in the sense of its embodying and representing the whole Church. After the Babylonish exile, the solemn gathering in the temple, which could only be enjoyed on special occasions, and not without difficulty, led to the establishment of synagogues, accessible in every place and to all, which may be regarded as the revival—without the admixture of former errors—of the ancient monotheistic or orthodox worship of the "high places," and which unconsciously served as the prototype for the arrangement and form of the Church under the New Testament. According to Jewish tradition, the institution of synagogues dates from a very early period (comp. the art. in Winer's [W. Smith, vol. iii., 1396 sqq., and other] Bibl. Encycls., and especially Vitringa, *De Synagoga vetere*, 1696). The statement is correct, in so far as it implies that a provision for religious communion and edification must have existed even previous to the temple. "During the Babylonish exile, when the Jews were shut out from the Holy Land and from the appointed sanctuary, the want of places for religious meetings, in which the worship of God, without sacrifices, could be celebrated, must have been painfully felt. Thus synagogues may have originated at that ominous period. When the Jews returned from Babylon, synagogues were planted throughout the country for the purpose of affording opportunities for publicly reading the law, independently of the regular sacrificial services of the temple (Neh. viii. 1, etc.). At the time of Jesus there was at least one synagogue in every moderately sized town of Palestine (such as Nazareth, Capernaum, etc.), and in the cities of Syria, Asia Minor, and Greece, in which Jews resided (Acts ix. 2 sqq.). Larger towns possessed several synagogues; and it is said that there were no fewer than 460, or even 480, of them in Jerusalem itself."—Winer. A kindred institution were the προσευχαί, or places where prayer was wont to be made—oratories, commonly situate in the immediate vicinity of some river, for the sake of lustrations (Acts xvi. 13); while synagogues were generally built in some elevated situation (in allusion to the position of the temple). The synagogue may be regarded as forming in every respect the germ of our local Christian churches. 1. Their foundation: by communities, or by private individuals. 2. Character: sanctuaries. 3. Time of meeting: on the Sabbath, on feast days; afterward also on the second and fifth days of the week. 4. Arrangement: seats, separation of sexes. 5. Mode of worship: prayer, reading of portions of Scripture (the Law, the Prophets, and other Old Testament books—Parashoth, Haphtharoth, Megilloth) by a priest or elder; exposition of the section read, and address; liberty of putting questions, of expressing opinions, and of delivering addresses (the prophetic element); at the close, the priestly blessing and prayer of the congregation. 6. Officials of the synagogue: the president, or chief ruler (ἄρχων τῆς συναγωγῆς, ἀρχισυναγωγός); the elders (πρεσβύτεροι, ποιμένες), who administered the affairs of the synagogue; then the servant or messenger of the congregation (*legatus ecclesiæ*), who acted as precentor, clerk, and messenger; and the officer, or ὑπηρέτης [the attendant or minister who handed the volume to the reader and returned it to its place, Luke iv. 20]; with the addition, probably, of officials to collect the alms. 7. Furniture: seats, pulpit or desk, and bookcase. 8. Discipline: greater and lesser excommunication, and bodily punishments. Every Jewish town possessed its Sanhedrim, which was subordinate to the great Sanhedrim in Jerusalem. These Sanhedrims were no doubt attached to the various synagogues (comp. Winer, sub *Synedrium*). Thus, in the providence of God, the synagogue was destined to form a transition from the symbolical worship of the Old, to the worship in spirit and in truth of the New, Testament. Hence the circumstance, that the Lord and His Apostles made use of the arrangements of the synagogue, must be regarded not only as an act of legal obedience, but also of missionary foresight.

From various passages we infer that at first Jesus was regarded by His disciples as a Rabbi (Mark ix. 5; John i. 38, etc.). But in their minds this title implied acknowledgment of His claims as prophet and Messiah, and it gradually gave place to full recognition of Jesus as the Son of God (Matt. xvi. 16). The people also regarded the Lord at first as a Rabbi (Mark x. 51; John xx. 16), although the leading men in Jerusalem were not willing to accede to Him that designation (John vii. 15). The title *Rabbi* (רַבִּי, *vir amplissimus*) was the honorary designation given to Jewish teachers of the law and scribes (*Magister, Doctor*). At the time of Christ, there was no formal graduation, as at a later period; although several characteristics served to distinguish the regular order of scribes. These were, 1. adherence to a certain school, and to scholastic traditions; 2. a peculiar method of explaining the law and interpreting the Scriptures; 3. connection with the hierarchy and the orthodoxy of the time (Pharisaism), although a number of the scribes belonged to the sect of the Sadducees; 4. the commencement of a regular organization of the order. Some of the Rabbins were members or assessors of the Sanhedrim; others presided over schools; while yet others were employed as legal advisers, etc. The Rabbins were regarded by the people as successors of the ancient prophets, with certain modifications adapting their office to the wants of the time. Accordingly, Ezra already bears the title of סֹפֵר. When the Lord Jesus therefore appeared as a Rabbi, without having previously passed through a regular scholastic training, He only asserted the ancient right and title of a prophet.

And preaching the gospel of the kingdom.—Here it is more definitely called the *Gospel* of the kingdom of heaven; *i. e.*, the Gospel which consti

tuted the kingdom of heaven, and which increasingly manifested itself as the Gospel concerning Christ, the Lord of the kingdom of heaven, and concerning reconciliation through Him for the kingdom of heaven.—Εὐαγγέλιον. The meaning of the term in classical Greek is, primarily, *reward for good tidings;* and, secondarily, *the good tidings* themselves; in the New Testament, it is used simply for *good tidings*. The announcement, that the kingdom of Messiah was at hand, made throughout the synagogues of Galilee, was of such deep and decisive importance as to require some confirmation of the prophetic character of Him who declared it. Hence Jesus proved by His miracles that He was able **to heal all manner of sickness, and all manner of disease**; thereby confirming His word. But the ultimate aim of these miracles was the manifestation of Jesus Himself, and of the kingdom of heaven, whereby the kingdom of darkness was vanquished.

Ver. 24. **His fame went throughout all Syria.**—On the one hand, throughout Palestine; and, on the other, beyond its limits to Phœnicia and Syria proper. Probably His fame spread along the road frequented by caravans, which led from Damascus to the Mediterranean by the Sea of Galilee.

And they brought unto Him all sick people.—The passage must, of course, be taken in a restricted sense: as far as faith in His miraculous power extended, they brought such sufferers to Him.

That were taken with divers diseases and torments.—The latter term, though referring to a distinct class of suffering, is still a general expression. Three peculiar kinds of disease are specially mentioned: viz., **those which were possessed with devils** (*demoniacs*, δαιμονιζόμενοι), **lunatics** (*epileptics*, σεληνιαζόμενοι), and **those that had the palsy** (*nervous disorders*, παραλυτικοί). Formerly, commentators were wont to regard the *demoniacs* as persons whose bodies were possessed by the devil, or by devils, but who labored under no physical ailment. Rationalistic interpreters, on the other hand, applied these expressions to bodily or mental diseases exclusively, as to mania, epilepsy, melancholy, etc., which —according to their statement—popular ignorance and prejudice regarded as a possession by devils. Of late, however, sounder views have obtained; and we have learned to recognize both elements in these unfortunate persons, viz., demoniac influences, and excitements produced by unclean spirits, along with bodily or mental derangements (see the author's *Leben Jesu*, ii. 1, p. 285). Meyer (note to p. 115) disposes rather summarily of this view, and repeats the old rationalistic theory.* The difference between the three classes consists in this, that the demoniacs were subject to disease through the influence of unclean spirits, the lunatics through that of the sidereal bodies (change of the moon, etc.), the palsied through that of atmospheric changes. The common characteristic of all these afflictions was, that their victims were under the absolute control of some outward influence, whether spiritual, psychical, or physical. They were, so to speak, the representatives of those more obscure and refined psychical and physical sufferings and dissonances which have been introduced in the psychical and external world by the moral power of darkness. (For a list of books on *Pastoral Medicine* or *Cure of Souls*, *see* Heubner, p. 43.)

Ver. 25. **And there followed Him great multitudes.**—Even at this stage of His ministry, multitudes had gathered, who externally followed the Lord. These were drawn in the first instance from **Galilee** itself, and swelled by others coming from **Decapolis**, and even from **Jerusalem**, from the land of **Judæa**, and **from** beyond **Jordan**, *i. e.*, Peræa. **Decapolis**, or the Ten Cities, chiefly inhabited by Gentile settlers: *see* Plinius, *Hist. Nat.* 16, and the Encyclops. According to Ritter, the Decapolis was founded principally by veterans from the army of Alexander (hence one of the towns was called Pella, from the city of that name in Macedonia). The expression, Peræa, refers probably to the northern part of that province. On the division of Peræa into three distinct districts, comp. von Raumer, *Palæstine*, p. 205.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. Note the contrast between Jesus going from place to place, and the Baptist remaining stationary. It seems to represent the moving and kindly character of the Gospel, as embodied in a personal form.

2. From the conduct of Jesus, we infer that He recognized the use and place of the synagogue in the arrangement of Divine Providence. The Apostles also observed the same line of conduct..

3. The Lord now proclaimed everywhere the Gospel of the kingdom of heaven. The announcement, that a new spiritual order of things was at hand, was everywhere received as a message of coming salvation. But the Lord also proclaimed at the same time the fundamental laws and promises of the kingdom of heaven, as appears from the Sermon on the Mount. By the numerous miracles which Jesus now wrought, He proved that the kingdom of heaven was really at hand; that its character was spiritual; that it was a kingdom of regeneration; and that this new spiritual life consisted in a heavenly influence and a Divine power, which restored not only the diseased and departed life, but also the dead and diseased heart. Thus it also clearly appeared that the kingdom of heaven was indissolubly connected with the person of Jesus. By His miracles, He revealed Himself in His glory as the centre of the kingdom of heaven. On miracles, comp. below, ch. viii.

* [Meyer's view is thus stated by him: "*Besessene waren characteristiche natürliche Kranke—Manie, Fallsucht, Melancholie, Zustände der Contractheit, temporäre Stummheit u. dergl.—deren Leiden man bei scheinbar physischer Gesundheit nicht im abnormen Organismus oder in naturlichen Störungen des physischen Habitus, sondern in teufelischer Besessenheit begründet glaubte.*" He urges, among four reasons against the old orthodox view, mainly the entire silence of St. John, which he regards the more significant, as John lays special stress on the destruction of the works of the devil by Christ. But this silence concerning the healing of demoniacs must be accounted for on the same ground as the omission of other and more important facts in the Gospel of John, such as the parabolic discourses of Christ, the institution of baptism, and the Lord's Supper, etc. This silence is rather the silence of approval of what was already generally known and read in the churches when he wrote his Gospel. Aside from doctrinal considerations connected with the personal existence of Satan and his supernatural agents, Meyer's and de Wette's view is even exegetically untenable, unless we choose to involve Christ in a popular error, or to reflect on His veracity, which is not to be thought of for a single moment. For the δαιμονιζόμενοι are clearly and repeatedly distinguished in the Gospels from ordinary physical diseases, and represented as persons who are spiritually afflicted and possessed or interpenetrated as it were by a double consciousness and a double will, the one being foreign to them and taking forcible possession of their physical frame for a time. Christ moreover addresses the evil spirits as distinct from the persons possessed by them; and these spirits pass out from one person into another, or even into a herd of swine. Comp. also, on the general subject, the remarks of Dr. Trench, *On the Miracles*, p. 160, and Dr. Alford *on Matt.* viii. 32 (4th ed. vol. i. p. 79 sq.).—P. S.]

4. Like John, Jesus produced by His preaching a general impression upon the people, but in a higher measure. John remained stationary, Jesus went about; John announced the wrath to come, Jesus brought to light the life-giving power of the Gospel; John displayed only one miracle, that of self-renunciation and the moral greatness of a true prophet as exhibited in his own history; he did no wonders; while it appeared as the inmost and distinguishing characteristic of Christ's life to work miracles of healing, of deliverance, of comfort, and of salvation.—To John the people flocked in numbers, again to return to their homes; while of those who betook themselves to Jesus, many remained to follow Him whithersoever He went.

5. In measure as the kingdom of heaven shall appear in the Church, the same Divine power—the same power of faith, of love and of life, and the same heavenly courage which ascends to heaven and descends from it, to diffuse that which is heavenly, will also manifest itself.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Christ went about doing good to all.—1. He *went about* in the omnipotence of His love. 2. He *did good to all* in the omnipotence of His love.—The labors of ministers should extend to all within the sphere of their activity.—Galilee, or the circuit of the Gentiles, becomes the circuit of the new life.—In preaching the Gospel, we should follow up God's preparatory agencies and dispensations.—Evangelists should endeavor to find proper starting-points for their work. —The teaching of Jesus in its fulness. It is, 1. a preaching (an appeal to the heart, announcing something new); 2. it is Gospel; 3. it is the Gospel of the kingdom; 4. it conveys salvation.—Defects to be avoided in the Church: 1. It is sad when teaching ceases to be preaching; 2. more sad when preaching ceases to be teaching; 3. most sad when preaching ceases to be the Gospel of the kingdom; 4. not less sad when destitute of the power of life.—In our days also, demonstration of the truth of the Gospel which we preach is indispensable.—The practical demonstration of the truth of the Gospel should be as follows: 1. Our preaching should always bear the impress of the love of Christ, of the Holy Spirit, and of power. 2. It should always be adapted to the wants of the age.—The secret of Christ's power of helping His people lay in their spiritual boldness: 1. Based on spiritual humility; 2. springing from spiritual faith; 3. manifesting itself in spiritual love; 4. evidenced by spiritual life.—Spiritual cowardice opens the door to the enemy.—Jesus still removes every manner of sickness and disease.—The fame of Jesus prepares the way for the word of Jesus.—The Saviour from sin is also the Saviour from evil.—He healed all that came unto Him.—In trouble and necessity we learn to know our Deliverer.—The kingdom of Christ commencing amidst poverty and misery. The relation between those who follow the wonder-worker, and those who follow the Crucified One. —Conversion the evidence of true awakening.—Jesus gathers His people. 1. How? 2. For what purpose?

Starke:—Christ extends His kingdom by the Gospel, not with carnal weapons.—It is a small thing for Him who gives us eternal life to restore our bodily life.—All Christ's miracles are blessings.

Heubner:—These cures of Jesus are important; as being so many blessings and deliverances of wretched and needy persons; as revelations of His goodness and love; as evidence of His divine mission; as pointing to the spiritual deliverance which He wrought.

PART SECOND.

CHRIST manifesting Himself in outward obscurity as the true Saviour, by His works; and proving Himself the promised Prophet, Priest, and King, in His continual conflict with the spurious notions entertained by the Jews concerning the Messiah (ch. v.–xvi. 12).

FIRST SECTION.

CHRIST MANIFESTING HIMSELF AS THE PROPHET. A. AS TEACHER OF THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN. THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT, CH. V.–VII.

Structure of the Sermon on the Mount.—The grand fundamental idea of the Sermon on the Mount is to present the righteousness of the kingdom of heaven in its relation to that of the Old Testament theocracy. This idea is arranged in three parts. Part first, which comprises the Sermon on the Mount in the narrower sense, presents the nature and character of the righteousness of the kingdom of God, from the commencement of spiritual life to its completion. Ch. v. 1–16.—At the close of this section,

the contrast between this righteousness and that of Jewish traditionalism is brought out in its fullest manifestation (to suffer persecution for Christ's sake). This induces the Lord to explain, in Part 2, the relation between the righteousness of the kingdom of heaven (in doctrine and life) and that of the Jewish theocracy. The former is the genuine fulfilment of the Old Testament theocracy (of the Law and the Prophets), in opposition to that false development of Jewish traditionalism, which only preserved the letter of the law and the prophets. Ch. v. 17–vii. 6.—As the first section contained a description of the *elevation of the blessed* to their final reward in heaven, although their course seems to the world one of continual humiliation; so the second section exhibits the righteousness of the Pharisees in its real character and results, to the judgment which shall finally sweep it away (beneath "dogs and swine"), although to the world it seems to rise to the greatest height of exaltation. Lastly, Christ shows in the third and practical section, how to avoid the false and choose the right way; indicating, at the same time, the mode and manner of genuine spiritual life (ch. vii. 7–27). The concluding verses (vers. 28 and 29) record the impression produced by this sermon of Jesus.

LITERATURE:—Comp. Tholuck, *Comment. on the Sermon on the Mount*, 4th ed. 1856 [transl. into Engl. by R. Lundin Brown, Edinb. and Philad., 1860]; Kling, *Die Bergpredigt Christi*, Marburg, 1841; Arndt, *Die Bergpredigt Jesu Christi*, Magdeb., 1837 and 1838; Braune, *Die Bergpredigt unseres Herrn Jesu Christi*, 2d ed., Altenburg, 1855.—For the older literature of the subject, *see* Winer, Danz, and Heubner.

I.

The Sermon on the Mount in the narrower sense. The law of the Spirit. The fundamental laws of the kingdom of heaven as fundamental promises and beatitudes of the Gospel. *Gradual progress upward to perfectness in righteousness*, or, what is the same, *in Christ*.

CHAPTER V. 1–16.

(*Vers.* 1–12, *the Gospel for the 27th Sunday after Trinity.*)

1 And seeing the multitudes, he went up into a mountain; and when he was set [had
2 sat down], his disciples came unto [to] him: And he opened his mouth, and taught
3 them, saying, Blessed *are* the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.
5 Blessed *are* they that mourn: for they shall be comforted. Blessed *are* the meek:
6 for they shall inherit the earth.[1] Blessed *are* they which do hunger and thirst after
7 righteousness: for they shall be filled. Blessed *are* the merciful: for they shall obtain
9 mercy. Blessed *are* the pure in heart: for they shall see God. Blessed *are* the peace-
10 makers: for they shall be called the children of God. Blessed *are* they which are per-
11 secuted for righteousness' sake: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are ye,
when *men* shall revile you, and persecute *you*, and shall say all manner of evil against
12 you falsely,[2] for my sake. Rejoice, and be exceeding glad; for great is your reward
13 in heaven: for so persecuted they the prophets which [who] were before you. Ye are
the salt of the earth: but if the salt have lost its savour, wherewith shall it be salted?
it is thenceforth good for nothing, but to be cast out, and to be trodden under foot of
14 men. Ye are the light of the world. A city that is set on a hill cannot be hid.
15 Neither do men light a candle and put it under a [the][3] bushel, but on a candlestick;
16 and it giveth light unto all that are in the house. Let your light so shine before men,
that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which [who] is in heaven.

[1] Ver. 5.—The transposition of the second and third beatitudes in Lachmann's and Tischendorf's editions is not sufficiently sustained by the testimony of Cod. D., the Vulgate, etc., and is at war with the logical order of the beatitudes.

[2] Ver. 11.—*Falsely*, ψευδόμενοι, is poorly supported, and superfluous on account of the words: *for My sake*. [The evidence against ψευδόμενοι is hardly sufficient to justify its removal from the text. The Vatican codex (as given by Buttmann) and other weighty MSS. and ancient versions have it, and Alford, Wordsworth, and Tregelles retain it, but Tregelles marks it as doubtful. As to the connection, ψευδόμενοι belongs to εἴπωσι, or all the three preceding verbs, but not to ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ.—P. S.]

[3] Ver. 15.—[The definite article here indicates the familiar household measure.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

General Remarks on the Sermon on the Mount.—The Sermon on the Mount may be regarded as the central-point of Christ's ministry in Galilee. It was delivered during the first year of His public career, some time between the winter of 781 and the spring of 782 A. U. "The activity of John by the banks of Jordan probably continued till toward the winter of the

year 781. While he baptized in Galilee, Christ labored in Judæa. About the time that John was imprisoned in Galilee, the Sanhedrim of Jerusalem began to view with dislike the growing authority of Jesus. On this account, He left Judæa, and retired to Galilee. In the spring of the year 782, John was still in prison. At that time he sent the well-known embassy to Christ. From Matt. xi. 1, 2, we gather that this inquiry was made at the close of the first journey of Christ through Galilee; hence before His attending the feast of Purim, which is related in the Gospel of John (ch. v.). Soon afterward the execution of John took place, probably between Purim and Easter of the year 782" (*see* my *Leben Jesu*, ii. 1, p. 162).

We mark three stages in the journey of Jesus through Galilee. The first comprises the journey of Christ through the mountainous district of Upper Galilee. This is alluded to in general terms by Matthew in ch. iv. 23. The calling of the first four Apostles, together with the miraculous draught of fishes, Luke v. 1, and the sermon of the Lord by the Lake of Galilee, preceding that miracle, formed the commencement of this journey. Its close is marked by the Sermon on the Mount. On His second journey, the Lord passed beyond the bounds of Galilee proper into Upper Peræa. This tour commenced with His second sermon by the Lake of Galilee, on which occasion the Lord probably uttered the greater part of the parables concerning the kingdom of God. Other three Apostles were now added to the former. That journey closed with the expulsion of the Lord from Gadara, and some conflicts between Jesus and the Pharisees, and a few of the disciples of John (Matt. ix.). During His third tour, the Lord passed through the towns on the Lake of Galilee to Lower Galilee, and toward Samaria and Judæa. The number of the assistants and followers of Jesus was now increased from seven to twelve, who are set apart as His Apostles. The four companions of His first journey, and the seven who attended Him during the second, had only been His followers; but others are now added to their number. They are set apart to be His Apostles; and the Lord sends them before Him,—as yet, however, with limited powers, and for a definite purpose. The narrative of this journey commences with the calling of the Apostles, and with the instructions given to them. While the Apostles precede the Lord, holy women gather around and minister unto Him (Luke viii. 1–3). The towns of *Magdala*, in the southern part of the western shore of the lake, and *Nain*, between the southern side of Mount Tabor and the Lower Hermon, are mentioned as special points touched during this journey. Its goal—as appears from the sending of the twelve Apostles—was Jerusalem, where, according to John v., Jesus attended the feast of Purim. This journey, which was intended to terminate in Judæa, was interrupted by two events—the resolution of the Sanhedrim at Jerusalem to compass the death of Jesus (John vii. 1), and the execution of John the Baptist (Matt. xiv. 12; Mark vi. 30; Luke ix. 10).

A close review of this tour shows that Jesus undertook three public journeys to Jerusalem in order to awake the attention of His people, and to lead them to decide for the truth (John ii. 13; v.; xii. 9)

It is important to understand the *relation* between the Sermon on the Mount as given by *Matthew* and the account of it in *Luke* vi. 12 sqq.

According to Augustine (*De consensu evang.* ii. 19), Andr. Osiander, Büsching, Hess, Storr, Gratz, and others, the two sermons were delivered at different times. But most modern interpreters are agreed that they are only two different accounts of one and the same sermon of Jesus. Calvin, Schneckenburger, and Olshausen hold that the account in Matthew is the less authentic of the two; while Tholuck, Ebrard, and Meyer (p. 168), think that Luke derived his narrative from Matthew. Lastly, according to Strauss, neither of the two accounts is strictly authentic. In our opinion, they should be regarded as two different sermons delivered in close succession, —the one on the summit of a mountain in Galilee, the other, on a lower ridge of the same mountain; the one, addressed only to His disciples; the other, to all the people who had followed Him. Still, so far as their fundamental ideas and real subject-matter are concerned, the two sermons are identical, differing only in form and adaptation,—that reported by Matthew being addressed to the disciples, and hence esoteric in its form; while that given by Luke is exoteric, being addressed to the people. The fundamental idea of both is evidently the same—the exaltation of the humble and the humiliation of the proud. This idea is couched so as to correspond to the description of the Jewish year of jubilee, and expressed in the form of beatitudes. But the different aspects under which this fundamental truth is presented, show that originally two sermons had been delivered by the Lord; for, 1. the number of the beatitudes is not the same in the two sermons, and the beatitudes themselves are differently couched; 2. in the Gospel by Luke, there is always a woe to correspond to each of the beatitudes. This contrast appears, indeed, also in that portion of the sermon, as reported by Matthew, which treats of the righteousness of the Pharisees and its consequences, but in a form quite different from that in Luke. Add to this, 3. the difference in the account of the locality and the audience. According to Matthew, Jesus delivered the sermon on the top of a mountain, and sitting; while Luke relates that He came down and stood in the plain or on a plateau, to preach to the people. According to Matthew, "seeing the multitudes," He retired among His disciples; while Luke records that He came down with His disciples, and stood among the multitude in order to address them. "Thus we have evidently two different discourses on the same subject, and containing the same elements; and, before we adopt any hypothesis which would represent the one as inferior to the other, we should first endeavor to study them more closely, and to understand the *peculiar characteristics* of the two Gospels. Viewed in that light, these discourses bear each a distinctive character. The Sermon on the Mount, strictly so called, is a discourse which Christ could not, at the time, have addressed to the people generally. This remark specially applies to His description of the Pharisees and scribes, and of their righteousness, and to His exposition of the contrast between His own teaching and theirs. Manifestly, Jesus could not have addressed in this manner the Jewish people generally, without thereby needlessly exposing His own followers. Nor were the people prepared to understand or receive such doctrine. And even though we were to assume that the Evangelist had introduced into this discourse some things said on other occasions, yet this sermon is so thoroughly connected in its structure, that it is impossible to ascribe its composition, so far as its leading features are concerned, to the Evangelist himself." (*Leben Jesu*, ii. 2, p. 369.) Manifestly, this discourse is esoteric—an exposition

of the fundamental doctrines of the kingdom of heaven in their relation to the teaching of the Old Testament, and to the ordinances and practices of a spurious traditionalism, which could only have been intended for the disciples. Hence the choice of the locality, the retirement from the multitude, and the gathering of the disciples around Him. The Evangelist, indeed, records at the close, "that the people were astonished at His doctrine;" but this apparent inaccuracy—on our supposition—only confirms the view that, after His descent from the mountain, the Lord addressed to the people generally the discourse communicated by Luke. The latter is just what we would have expected in the circumstances—a popular and lively address, short, and illustrated by similes. This exoteric form agrees with the context as mentioned by Luke, who records that Jesus delivered this address standing among the people, though His eye would, no doubt, chiefly rest in blessing upon the disciples.

The **time** *when these two discourses were delivered.*—From some events recorded by Luke before his account of the Sermon on the Mount (ch. vi. 1, etc.), it might appear to have been delivered at a later period. But this apparent inaccuracy must have been occasioned by considerations connected with the structure of his Gospel. The context shows that both Evangelists record it as having taken place at the same time. Both in Luke and in Matthew the history of the centurion of Capernaum immediately follows the Sermon on the Mount. Manifestly, then, the two discourses were delivered during the same journey of Jesus through Galilee. Similarly, the circumstances mentioned by Luke prove that the discourse reported by him followed immediately upon that reported by Matthew. According to Matthew, Jesus left the multitude, and retired with His disciples to the top of the mountain; while Luke relates that He again descended from the mountain, with His disciples, "into the plain" (ἐπὶ τόπου πεδινοῦ), among the waiting multitude. If to this we add the manifest internal connection between the two discourses, we obtain a very distinct view of the subject. On the top of the mountain Jesus addressed to His disciples the discourse about the kingdom of heaven in an esoteric form: while immediately afterward He repeated it in an exoteric form, in the midst of the people, on a plateau of the same mountain.

The **locality,** *or the mountain.*—According to Latin tradition, the Mount of Beatitudes was what is now called the "*Horns of Hattin,*" between Mount Tabor and Tiberias. Robinson gives the following description of this mountain (ii. p. 370): "The road passes down to Hattin on the west of the Tell; as we approached, we turned off from the path toward the right, in order to ascend the Eastern Horn.—As seen on this side, the Tell or mountain is merely a low ridge, some thirty or forty feet in height, and not ten minutes in length from east to west. At its eastern end is an elevated point or horn, perhaps sixty feet above the plain; and, at the western end, another not so high; these give to the ridge, at a distance, the appearance of a saddle, and are called Kurun Hattin, 'Horns of Hattin.' But the singularity of this ridge is, that, on reaching the top, you find that it lies along the very border of the great southern plain, where this latter sinks off at once by a precipitous offset, to the lower plain of Hattin, from which the northern side of the Tell rises very steeply, not much less than 400 feet. . . . . *The summit of the Eastern Horn is a little circular plain; and the top of the lower ridge between the two horns is also flattened to a plain.* The whole mountain is of limestone."—The situation and the appearance of this mountain agree well with the supposition that it was the Mount of Beatitudes. It lay in a southwesterly direction, about seven miles from Capernaum. We can well conceive that, when, on His return from the journey through Galilee, Jesus reached this point, He partly dismissed the multitudes who had followed Him. The description of the top of the mountain, and of "the plain," agrees with the requirements of the case. Robinson has indeed shown that no weighty grounds can be urged in favor of this tradition (ii. p. 371). It is found only in the Latin Church, and is first mentioned in the 13th century by Brocardus [about A. D. 1283]; while this tradition is apparently contradicted by another, which designates the same mountain as the spot where Christ fed the five thousand with the five loaves. Still, no valid ground can be urged against it. A striking historical illustration, by way of contrast, is connected with the Horns of Hattin, assuming that ridge to be the Mount of Beatitudes. On the spot where Jesus had described the kingdom of heaven, and pronounced the meek and the peacemakers blessed, the most bloody battles have been fought! (*See* C. v. Raumer, p. 37.) On the 5th of July, 1187, the celebrated battle of Hattin took place, in which the last remnant of the Crusaders was destroyed on the height of Tell Hattin, after the army had been beaten by Sultan Saladin in the valley. Again, on the plain of Jezreel, Bonaparte defeated, in 1799, with 3000 men, an army of 25,000 Turks.—From the frequent repetition of the expression, **Jesus went up into a mountain,** εἰς τὸ ὄρος, Gfrörer and Bruno Bauer have inferred that the mountain was merely mythical, and that it always referred to one and the same locality. But in all these narratives, the term "mountain" is used in contradistinction to the places where the people were encamped (*Leben Jesu*, ii. 2, p. 676). Ebrard (*Kritik*, etc., p. 349) suggests that the expression is sufficiently explained by the circumstance, that throughout Palestine there was no plain from which mountains rose, but that the country was an extended plain intersected by valleys. But this is only partially true, as there are considerable mountain-tops in the country; although the configuration of Palestine may partly have given rise to such a general mode of expression as "*to go up into a mountain.*"

Occasion *of this address.*—According to Wieseler (*Chronologische Synopse*, p. 205), the year from the autumn 779 to that of 780 had been a sabbatical year. Thus the remembrance of the jubilee was still fresh in the minds of the people. For, although the peculiar ordinances connected with the jubilee were no longer observed even at the time of the prophets, the symbolical import of the institution must still have been cherished by the people. The passage from Isaiah lxi., which Jesus had shortly before read in the synagogue at Nazareth (Luke iv. 14, etc.), referred to the year of grace of the Lord. The symbolical idea of this institution which had pervaded the song of Mary, was fully unfolded and developed in the Sermon on the Mount. (*Leben Jesu*, ii. 2, p. 571.)

Relation *between the Sermon on the Mount as reported by Matthew, and the parallel passages in Luke and Mark.*—This relation is explained, 1. by the difference between the two discourses; 2. by the circumstance that Luke records in other passages the admonitions which were specially addressed to the disciples. This remark applies more especially tc

the Lord's Prayer, Luke xi. 1–4; to the admonition to prayer, vers. 9–13; to the simile in vers. 34–36; and to the warning against excessive care for the things of this life, Luke xii. 22–31. Still, it is possible that some of the statements in the first Sermon on the Mount, which recur in the other Gospels, may have been repeated on other occasions: for example, Mark ix. 50; Luke xii. 34; xiii. 24; xvi. 13, 17, 18. Others, again, may have been introduced by the Evangelist in another context: for example, Luke xii. 58.

Ver. 1. **And seeing the multitudes,** ἰδὼν δὲ, κ. τ. λ.—This is evidently meant to account for the delivery of the Sermon on the Mount. Jesus frequently saw multitudes around Him, but here a peculiar emphasis is laid on that circumstance. The question then arises, whether the crowding of the multitude around had induced Him to deliver the Sermon on the Mount in their presence, and that *with all which it contains concerning the scribes and Pharisees;* or whether, on the contrary, it had induced Him to explain these truths in a confidential manner to His disciples alone. We adopt the latter view, which is supported by the analogy of Mark iii. 12, 13; Luke vi. 12, 13; John vi. 23, comp. with ver. 15.

His disciples.—It is evident that at that period Jesus had already made a separation between His disciples and the people. But Matthew distinguishes between this and the later choice of the twelve Apostles, ch. x. 1. The expression implies that a larger circle of friends and assistants had gathered around Jesus, among whom the twelve occupied a prominent place.

Ver. 2. **And He opened His mouth.**—The phrase ἀνοίγειν τὸ στόμα, פָּתַח פֶּה, is, in the first place, oriental and pictorial; secondarily, it indicates an important element, that of confidential and solemn communication: Job iii. 1; Dan. x. 16. This applies especially to the moment when the Incarnate Word opened His mouth to enunciate the eternal principles of the New Covenant. We note here the contrast, as between Sinai and the Mount of Beatitudes, the law and the Gospel, so also between the speaking of God during the Old Testament, accompanied as it then was by thunder and lightning, and Jesus "opening His mouth" under the New Testament.

Vers. 3–16. The Sermon on the Mount, in the narrower sense (vers. 3–16) comprises the seven beatitudes, and their application to the disciples of Jesus under the twofold simile of the salt of the earth, and the light of the world; the latter being again arranged under two similes—that of the city on the hill, and that of the candlestick. The seven admonitions are rightly characterized as so many *beatitudes*. From this we infer, above all, the evangelical character of this discourse of Jesus, since, 1. He designates each stage in the development of the spiritual life a beatitude, because it imparts beatitude. The *blessedness* which Himself at the first imparts, is succeeded by *being blessed*, even unto *perfect* beatitude in glory. 2. Since, on that account, He does not prescribe any course of action conformable to the law or to His teaching, but a life conformable to the law, as a manifestation of His teaching. 3. He presents the great outlines of New Testament righteousness as consisting in self-knowledge, felt want, *suffering*, emptiness, or susceptibility, which the Lord will meet out of the heavenly fulness of His own kingdom. 4. He presents the blessings of the kingdom of heaven in their perfectness as spiritual in their character, and as the property of the beatified. 5. In the succession of these beatitudes He marks the development of the new life from its commencement to its completion. Luther: "This is indeed a fair, sweet, and pleasant commencement of His preaching and teaching. For He does not come in like Moses, or like a teacher of the law, with commands, threats, and terrors, but in the most kindly manner, with attractions, and allurements, and most sweet promises." The old arrangement into *seven* beatitudes is perfectly correct. The seventh beatitude, "*Blessed are the peacemakers,*" marks the climax: "*They shall be called the children of God.*" In the eighth beatitude, the other seven are only summed up under the idea of the righteousness of the kingdom of heaven in its relation to those who persecute it; while the ninth is a description of the eighth, with reference to the relation in which these righteous persons stand to Christ. The seven beatitudes, therefore, describe the blessedness of the righteousness of God, as it appears in the last instance, on the one hand, in being persecuted for righteousness' sake, and on the other, for Christ's sake. This also casts a new light upon each of the seven beatitudes: they are a conflict with false righteousness for true righteousness' sake: they are for Christ's sake, and they are a conflict for His sake.

The seven beatitudes form an ascending line, in which the new life is traced from stage to stage, from its commencement to its completion. At the basis we have poverty in spirit, the grand final result of the Old Testament discipline. But, in studying this ascending line of Christian righteousness or virtue, which rests on the basis of spiritual poverty, we must not lose sight of the parallels which they contain. Manifestly, each of the beatitudes expresses a new (religious) relationship toward God, and, side by side with it, a new (moral) relationship toward the world. This will appear more clearly from the following table:—

They which are persecuted for righteousness' sake.	The poor in spirit.		They which are persecuted for Christ's sake.
	They that mourn.	The meek.	
	They which do hunger and thirst after righteousness.	The merciful.	
	The pure in heart.	The peacemakers.	

Blessed are ye, the disciples, if ye are such. Thus shall ye be:—

(*a*) **The salt of the earth.** (*b*) The light of the world.

1. A city set on an hill.
2. A candle put on a candlestick.

Ver. 3. **Blessed,** Μακάριοι, אַשְׁרֵי, Ps. i. 1.—"From the explanatory sentences, which commence with ὅτι (vers. 3–10), we gather what blessedness Jesus has in view—that of the kingdom of

Messiah." Again, Jesus declares those blessed whom the men of the world would hold to be most unhappy He designates by that term circumstances which, to those looking merely at the outside, would appear far from enviable, and traits of character running directly contrary to the carnal views and the legal righteousness of the Jews. Hence these sentences are so many paradoxes. "Although these statements of Christ run directly counter to the carnal prejudices of His contemporaries, His utterances contain nothing that was either entirely new or unknown, since all these beatitudes are based upon passages of the Old Testament (Isa. lvii. 15; lxi. 1–3; Ps. xxxiv. 11–19; xxxvii. 11; lxxiii. 1.; 1 Sam. ii. 5; Ps. li. 19; Eccles. vii. 4, etc.)." O. von Gerlach. It is worthy of notice, that, like the beatitudes of Jesus, that in Ps. i. both presupposes a corresponding state of mind, and admonishes believers to cherish and seek such a spiritual disposition.

The poor in spirit, οἱ πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι.—The dative is here used to designate them more particularly: in their spirit, or in reference to their spirit, or spiritual life; those who feel themselves spiritually poor, and hence realize their deep and inexpressible want of the Spirit, and long for the religion of the Spirit. (The opposite of this in Rev. iii. 17.) Hence the expression does not imply poverty of spirit in reference to man, far less intellectual poverty (as Fritzsche thinks). The idea, that it refers to external poverty, voluntarily chosen, or to a vow of voluntary poverty, as some of the older Roman Catholic commentators imagine (Maldonatus, Cornelius à Lap.), deserves no further notice. The addition, τῷ πνεύματι, forms a primary and essential characteristic of Christianity. Although wanting in the corresponding passage in Luke, the expression refers there also to spiritual poverty. Köstlin fancies that the omission in Luke is due to Ebionite leanings; while Matthew purposely added the words, "in spirit," to mark the difference. But this hypothesis is only an attempt to carry out the theory of Baur, that the first Christians had been Ebionites. It is indeed true that the expression bears special reference to the poor and needy of the Old Testament theocracy (Isa. lxi. 1; lxvi. 2). But those Ebionites were not poor in the sense of their entertaining carnal expectations of the Messiah, but in that of spiritual longing for true righteousness. This feeling of spiritual poverty, which appeared at the time of the prophets, had now attained full maturity. It had been "*fulfilled;*" and hence coincided with the μετάνοια in its *origin*, as this grace unfolds in the two succeeding beatitudes, and forms the *germ* of the ταπεινοφροσύνη. The full meaning of the expression is brought out in the following remark of Tholuck:—"To translate accurately, we must render the term by *egeni* and *mendici*, for this is the meaning of πτωχός, while πένης corresponds to the Latin *pauper*." On the humility cherished by Gentile sages, especially on that of Socrates, comp. Heubner, p. 50.

Ver. 4. **They that mourn,** οἱ πενθοῦντες, Isa. lxi. 2.—We must not apply the term (with Chrysostom and most of the older interpreters) to deep mourning on account of sin, nor yet to sadness and sorrow in general. This state of mind is explained by the poverty in spirit from which it springs, and tends toward hungering and thirsting after righteousness. From the first, the righteousness of the kingdom of heaven was the great object aimed after,—even in poverty of spirit, much more in mourning. But as yet this object has not been clearly realized by the consciousness. Hence it implies spiritual mourning, divine sorrow, in opposition to the sorrow of the world (2 Cor. vii. 10). This mourning in God (by His Spirit), after God (His blessings), and for God (His glory), includes not only mourning on account of sin, but also on account of its consequences; more particularly, is it the expression of a state of mind when the world, with its possessions and pleasures, is no longer capable of satisfying, gladdening, or comforting. Those who thus mourn are to be comforted—of course, in the same sense in which they mourn; but their consolation is to be absolute (see Rom. viii. 18; 2 Cor. iv. 17; John xiv. 3). This comfort necessarily implies the forgiveness of sins; it also includes the promise that their godly sorrow shall, in every respect, be removed by the kingdom of heaven, which is promised to the poor in spirit.

Ver. 5. **The meek.**—Ps. xxxvii. 11, according to the Septuagint: οἱ δὲ πραεῖς κληρονομήσουσι γῆν. They who suffer in love, or love in patience; they who, in the strength of love, boldly yet meekly, meekly yet boldly, bear injustice, and thereby conquer. In this beatitude, the promise of the Holy Land (the enemies being drive nout) is a symbol of the kingdom of heaven; still, outward possession, and that in all its fulness, is also referred to in the expression: the *land*, the *earth*.

Ver. 6. **Hunger and thirst after righteousness.**—A figurative mode of indicating a desire so intense as to be painful. Wetstein. (The substantive is here in the accusative, τὴν δικαιοσύνην, though commonly in the genitive.) Δικαιοσύνη, with the article, *the only genuine righteousness*, the righteousness of the kingdom of heaven; but, above all, righteousness not as a work of our own, but as a gift,—a fact not of the outer, but of the inner life. Hence the expression refers neither to the Christian religion (Kuinoel) nor to *uprightness*, the restoration of wihch was, according to Meyer, the grand object of Christ. Righteousness is correspondence to the law; the righteousness of the kingdom of heaven, that to the law of the Spirit.

They shall be filled, *i. e.*, with righteousness.—This promise applies neither exclusively to justification by faith, nor to final acquittal in judgment; but includes both justification, sanctification, and final acquittal,—all of which, indeed, are inseparably connected with justification.

Ver. 7. **The merciful,** according to the standard of the righteousness of the kingdom of heaven. De Wette applies this in the first place to the members of the theocracy, who, victorious over the Gentiles, should not execute vengeance upon them. The idea is correct, if taken in a higher and a spiritual sense. They a.: the meek, who, having formerly been on the defensive, have now taken the offensive. The *meek* bear the injustice of the world; the *merciful* bravely address themselves to the wants of the world. They shall obtain mercy, as being the objects of mercy. As mourning, they are delivered from the *sorrows* of life; as longing after righteousness, from the *guilt* of life; and now as the merciful, from all the *misery* of life. But this is only the negative element; the positive appears in the gradation: they shall be comforted, they shall be satisfied, they shall obtain mercy, be inwardly renewed and restored. And all this, in accordance with the grand fundamental principle of the kingdom of God. See Matt. vii. 2.

Ver. 8. **The pure in heart,** οἱ καθαροὶ τῇ καρ-

ν *ί* *ᾳ*.—This must refer to righteousness as the ruling principle of the heart and inner life. Purity of heart consists in that steady direction of the soul toward the divine life which excludes every other object from the homage of the heart. Hence "inward moral integrity" is not sufficient; irrespective of the fact, that such integrity bears reference to an external moral standard. Our Lord, however, does not require absolute purity; else He would have said: *They behold God.* The term refers to a life pure in the inmost tendency and direction of the heart, because it is entirely set upon what is eternally and absolutely pure. Hence it applies to walking in the Spirit, or to a life of sanctification, or to being born of God (1 John iii. 9). When thus the inmost heart is pure, its outgoings in life will also be pure. The inner life will ever manifest itself more and more clearly as "seeing God."

They shall see God.—The expression does not refer merely to an internal knowledge of God (according to Gregory of Nyssa, Theophylact, Tholuck, etc.), nor (according to de Wette) to direct spiritual communion with God here and hereafter,—far less to Messianic beatitude generally (Kuinoel and others), under the Oriental figure of a man beholding his king, or appearing before him. These ideas are, however, included in the final and perfect seeing of God. But, on the other hand, we cannot agree with Meyer, that it refers to the beatific vision of saints, when in the resurrection body they shall behold the glory of God in the kingdom of His Son (Rev. xxii. 4). For it is evident that in all these seven promises no interval of space or time intervenes between the longing and the satisfaction. This vision of God commences when the eye of the soul opens, or when spiritual vision begins in the regenerate heart (Eph. i. 18): it is perfected when in eternity we shall see Him face to face (1 Cor. xiii. 12; 1 John iii. 2).

Ver. 9. **The peacemakers,** οἱ εἰρηνοποιοί.—The *peacemakers* of the true theocracy, not merely the *peaceful,* εἰρηνικοί, James iii. 17. It denotes the exertions made by the pure heart on behalf of the kingdom of heaven, alluding more particularly to the *messengers of peace* under the New Testament,—not with reference to their official capacity, but to the power and truth of the word which they bear (Col. i. 20; Prov. xii. 20). The promise which immediately follows, corresponds with their exalted position as here indicated.

They shall be called the sons of God (in the full theocratic sense, as *children of age,* υἱοί, and not merely τέκνα).—The term is not simply equivalent to such expressions as υἱοθεσία and κληρονομία, in Rom. viii. 17, and Gal. iv. 5-7 (Meyer), nor to being beloved of God (Kuinoel), nor to being like unto God (Paulus); but indicates that, by their fellowship with the Son, and their dependence upon Him, they enjoy the exalted rank of full-grown children of God. They are the children of God as the messengers of Christ, the instruments of His kingdom, and the organs of the Holy Ghost. The term *sons* may have been used, because the only begotten Son had not yet fully revealed Himself in that character; after which they appear as His *friends,* His *representatives,* His messengers, and His organs. Their dignity and glory in the kingdom of heaven—viewed spiritually—constitutes the promise given to them. Hence "κληθήσονται, not *erunt* (Kuinoel), but what they really are, is here expressly *recognized* by the *name* given to them."—Meyer.

Ver. 10. **They which are persecuted,** δεδιωγμένοι.—Here the conflict between the new spiritual theocracy and its old degenerate form is introduced, forming a transition from the ideal representation of the disciples to the circumstances in which they were actually placed, and which are specially referred to in the following verse.—By **righteousness** is not merely meant here the grace alluded to in ver. 6; it rather comprises the substance of all the seven beatitudes,—*i. e.,* righteousness not merely in its grand manifestation, but also in its first origin and final completion, *more especially* in the form in which it appears in the peacemakers, exciting the resistance of the world (see Matt. x.; 1 Pet. iii. 14.)

Theirs is the kingdom of heaven.—The same expression as in ver. 3. Nor, indeed, could the kingdom of heaven be here different from what it was at the outset; only the manner of its possession and enjoyment is now other than it had been. To the poor in spirit the kingdom of heaven consists, in the first place, in their being comforted; while those who are persecuted for righteousness' sake will, according to ver. 12, partake of that great reward in heaven itself which is promised to all who suffer for the sake of Christ. In ver. 3, we have the kingdom of heaven with all that it implies,—here, with all that it imparts; there' as objectively set before us, —here, as our own personal and actual possession.

Ver. 11. **Blessed are ye when men shall revile you,** *etc.,* **for my sake.**—This is the special application of what the Lord had above declared, or the interpretation of the language used in ver. 10. The disciples are those who are blessed; righteousness is personified in the Lord. Yet there is this difference: the Lord is so unconditionally; the disciples conditionally, viz., in as far as they prove themselves disciples. We are not inclined, with Beza, to limit the expressions, "*revile and persecute,*" to outward sufferings by the civil magistrate. The expression ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ refers to all the three verbs, and the word ψευδόμενοι is accordingly superfluous.

By pointing to the great reward in heaven, the Lord sets the fact more clearly than ever before His hearers, that the kingdom of Messiah is not of this world, and that perfectness will only be attained there, while here we are to prepare for it by suffering and witness-bearing on behalf of Christ.

Ver. 12. **For so persecuted they the prophets.**—The example of the prophets was intended to show the disciples that this struggle between them and carnal Judaism was not of recent date, but had been carried on even at the time of the prophets (Acts vi. 7). But it would also convince them that they stood on the same level with the seers of old, and that they were to continue and complete Divine revelation under the New Testament.

Ver. 16. The high calling of the disciples had been announced in the beatitudes. The Lord now proceeds to show more fully both its necessity and its glory. Viewing their calling, 1. in its *spiritual* and *inward* aspect, the disciples are the *salt of the earth;* 2. viewed *externally,* and in their *corporate* capacity, they are the *light of the world,* viz., (*a*) a city set on a hill, as being the *Church of God,* and (*b*) candle on a candlestick, in their capacity as *Apostles.* These two ideas, however, must not be viewed as exclusive of each other.

Ver. 13. **The salt of the earth.**—A figure of the element of nourishment and preservation in the kingdom of heaven, preventing corruption, preserving nutriment, giving savor to it, and rendering it

healthy. A similar use of the term "*salt*" occurs in many of the proverbs and symbols of the ancients. —The idea, that the term salt is here used to indicate an indispensable commodity (Fritzsche), is far too vague; nor does it exclusively refer to the use of salt in sacrifices,—the expression implying that they were the salt of the whole earth.—The term "*earth*" is figurative, denoting, not mankind generally, but society as then existing, both in the theocracy and the Gentile world,—being the definite form which the world had assumed (Ps. xciii.; John iii. 12; Rev. xiii. 11). The disciples were destined, as the salt of the ancient theocratic world, to arrest the corruption which had commenced, and to impart a fresh and lasting savor.

But if the salt have lost its savor, μωρανθῇ.—In Mark ix. 50, ἄναλον γένηται. Comp. with this the following extract from Maundrell's Journey to Palestine: "In the salt-valley, about four hours from Aleppo, there is a declivity of about twelve feet, caused by the continual removal of salt. I broke off a piece where the ground was exposed to the rain, the sun, and the air; and found that, while it glittered and contained particles of salt, it had wholly lost its peculiar savor. But the portions within, which were in juxtaposition to the rock, still retained the savor of salt." Comp. also Winer sub *Salz* [and other Biblical Encyclops]. Salt which is quite pure cannot lose its savor, but only if it have any foreign admixture. The same remark applies to our spiritual life. Viewed in itself, it remains pure salt; but in its human form, and with the admixture of human elements, it may lose its savor. At the same time the Lord here speaks hypothetically: *if* the salt have lost its savor. The point of comparison in the figure lies in the idea: salt which has lost its savor cannot be salted again, nor a corrupted evangelist be evangelized anew. Jansen: *non datur sal salis.* (Comp., however, 2 Pet. ii. 21; Heb. vi. 4.) For the *salt* is the thing to be salted [as the Com. E. Vers. correctly translates: "wherewith shall *it* be salted?"], comp. the following εἰς οὐδὲν, etc., and not the *food*, as Luther's version would make it: "Womit soll *man* salzen?" ("Wherewith shall men salt?") An apostate from the faith has, so far as he is concerned, made void the saving power of salvation; nor is there another and higher substitute for the spiritual office of the ministry, if once it have become degenerate.

There remains, then, only the judgment. Salt which has lost its savor is only fit to be cast out, and trodden under foot of men. Those who are henceforth to carry on and continue the history of the world, will tread it under foot as they pass on their way. According to Theophylact, it refers to exclusion from the office of teacher; according to Chrysostom, to greatest contempt; according to Luther, to rejection by Christ.

Ver. 14. **Ye are the light of the world.**—Comp. John ix. 5. In all these descriptions of the disciples, the Lord presupposes that His Spirit and His righteousness have become the principle of their life. They are the light of the world, as deriving their light from Him who is the true light of the world (Eph. iii. 9; Phil. ii. 15), just as they are the sons of God in Him who is the eternal Son of God. —Thus He awakens in them the knowledge of *His* own dignity by a sense of *their* destiny.

A city set on a hill.—It is generally supposed that Jesus had at the time the town of Safed in view, which lies on the top of a hill. But Robinson has shown [iii. p. 425] that this supposition is, to say the least, improbable, since it is doubtful whether Safed then already existed.

Ver. 15. **Under a bushel.**—The common measure used in houses, holding about a peck. "In the East, the practice is to place a candle on the floor, and to cover it with a measure used for corn, when it is desired to keep it burning and yet to prevent its effects for a time" (?).—Tholuck. Just as the candlestick is the means of diffusing the light, so the bushel that of confining it; or, realizing the full idea of an upturned bushel, confining it within very narrow limits. The same relation exists between the limited measure of *officialism*, of *intellect*, of *asceticism*, of *traditionalism in life or teaching*, and the infinite fulness of light issuing from living Christianity.

The candle on the candlestick.*—The ministry should not conceal the light of knowledge, but hold it up, so that its brightness may be diffused as widely as possible throughout the apartment.

Ver. 16. **Your light.**—This proves that the light by which they become candlesticks is not their own, but given from above. It is this light which is to shine before all men; in other words, they are openly and boldly to come forward with the message of the New Testament, in accordance with their vocation as disciples.

That they may see your good works.—From the wording of the passage, we infer, that by the good works something different is meant from the light mentioned above. We regard them as the special graces and manifestations of the disciples (such as miracles, the creation of a new life, the fruits of regeneration), which must be viewed in the light of Christianity, and may serve as a practical commentary on the word.

Glorify your Father.—A most glorious prospect is here opened up to those who are reviled and persecuted. A lively representation this, also, of the conviction wrought in men, and of the blessed certitude resulting from the conduct of the disciples. Men shall glorify the Father of the Christians; and hence, also, adopt their faith and their acknowledgment of God in Christ, and thus become blessed. But all the glory is to be the Lord's.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. In the Sermon on the Mount, the whole doctrine of Christ is exhibited in the first stage of its development, as afterward it is expounded in a somewhat analogous manner in the Epistle of James. We have here the new Christian life as the eternal law of the Spirit, or else the old law in its Christian transformation as a new life. If it is said that the Lord here exhibited the law, or Old Testament righteousness, in all its fulness, we add, that this fulness of the law removed the legal character of the law. The spirit of the law transforms the outward letter into something internal, into a power of life and vital principle; it substitutes one reality in place of many ordinances; and instead of the *series* of ten commandments (and ten is the number of the world,

* [Dr. Conant substitutes *lamp* on the *lamp stand*, since the C. V. may make a false impression; the candlestick being necessary to this use of the candle, whether hid under a vessel or not. "The *lamp* (λύχνος), being low, was placed on a support (λυχνία) sufficiently high to give light through the room; and this latter would be equally necessary to the candle with its candlestick, as we use the terms."—P. S.]

while seven is that of the sanctuary), a *succession* of seven stages of sacred and spiritual development of the new life. The former contrast between the demands of God and the performances of man—between the Judge and the guilty sinner—becomes now that of blessing and receiving, between a gracious Father and merciful Saviour, and the humble believer. In short, righteousness in all its fulness consists in this, that Christ Himself is all righteousness, and that His righteousness is imparted to man through the grand medium of reception, viz., poverty in spirit.

As the passage under consideration describes the kingdom of heaven in its principles, power, and graces, so Matt. x. details its organization, which marks the second stage in the development of the teaching of Christ.

2. The contrast between the Old and the New Covenant is here strikingly brought out,—(*a*) In its *representations* and outward *manifestation:* Moses and Christ.—Mount Sinai in the rocky wilderness, and the Mount of Beatitudes in the midst of a populous district in the Holy Land.—Moses alone, concealed from view by the clouds of an awful thunderstorm; Christ surrounded by His disciples, and sitting among them.—Mount Sinai, with bounds set about it, and the people at a distance; the Mount of Beatitudes encompassed by multitudes.—In the one case, the people fleeing from the mountain; in the other, crowding toward its summit, and waiting on its ridge. (*b*) In its essential *characteristics:* Moses received the law from Jehovah by the ministry of angels, while in a state of ecstasy; but Christ brought it forth from the depths of His theanthropic heart, in full and calm consciousness.—The law of Moses written upon tablets of stone, the word of Christ on the hearts of His disciples.—In the one case, thunder and lightnings; in the other, only beatitudes.—In the one case, successive demands, each isolated, and each taking away all hope of life; in the other, successive blessings, connected together and creative, almost like the six days of creation.—In the one case, the first tables of the law broken in pieces by Moses, in his wrath at the apostasy of the people, and other tables substituted with sacrificial injunctions, stricter than the former; in the other case, the first sermon delivered on the Mount, and at its second delivery, adapted to the wants and the weaknesses of the people.—In the one case, everything from without, in the objective form of outward commandments; in the other, everything committed to the heart—everything from within, wafted, so to speak, in the life-giving breezes of the holy mountain.—In the one case, the ancient Gospel-promise transformed into law; in the other, even the law with its demands—such as poverty of spirit, etc.—transformed into Gospel.—In the one case, the theocracy founded in the shadows of the letter; in the other, the kingdom of heaven in the reality and life of the Spirit. (*c*) In its *results:* Sinai was adapted to a particular era, to a particular nation, and for a definite educational purpose.* But the word of Christ equally applies to all times and to all peoples, being the guide to salvation.—The law terrifies the people, and makes them flee; the Sermon on the Mount addresses itself to their hearts, and draws them to the Lord.

3. There is an obvious connection between the Mount of Beatitudes and the other holy mountains. The first beatitude (that of the poor in spirit) brings us to Sinai; the second and third (the mourning, and the meek) point to Moriah and Zion; the fourth and fifth (those who hunger and thirst after righteousness, and the merciful) direct to Golgotha, in its twofold import (as the Mount of the Curse and that of Reconciliation); while the sixth and seventh remind us of Gethsemane and the Mount of Olives, and of Bethany and the Mount of Olives, or also of Mount Tabor.

4. It were a great mistake to place the seven beatitudes of the Sermon on the Mount in the same category with the ten commandments of the law. This were not to enrich, but to make them all the poorer. Their fulness consists in this, that each of these beatitudes comprises all the ten commandments, only from a higher and more comprehensive point of view, as summed up in the law of the Spirit. Even the first quality of poverty in spirit comprises Mount Sinai, with all its commandments, inasmuch as this state of feeling is the aim, the object, the spiritual effect, and the substance of the entire legislation; and hence, also, the germ of the whole new life. It is impossible to feel poor in spirit, without at the same time longing for the riches of the Spirit of God, or of the kingdom of heaven. Hence we draw the following inferences as to the succession of the beatitudes: (1) Each new stage contains again the first stage in a new form. (2) Each new stage preserves all the former stages. (3) In the last, they are summed up and presented under the form of life which has attained its perfection. For, first, it is evident that the seven beatitudes are in reality only one beatitude. Secondly, the seven graces or spiritual states constitute one grand direction in reference to God and to our neighbor, even the direction of the heart unto truth. Lastly, the seven promises are not seven distinct elements, but seven successive forms under which the kingdom of heaven is presented. Under the first form, the kingdom of heaven itself is presented, but mainly objectively; while in the last form it reappears, but this time mainly subjectively, as finally possessed by the saints.

5. The following contrasts exhibit the relation between the apparent descent, and the actual ascent of souls, as presented in the seven beatitudes.

(1) To be poor in spirit, and	—To possess the kingdom of heaven, as the object set before us, or as possession of the heart.
(2) To mourn without measure,	—To be comforted without measure.
(3) Meekly to bear injustice upon earth,	—To obtain the dominion of the earth by spiritual triumphs.
(4) To hunger and thirst in *spirit* after righteousness (to bear the judgment of God),	—To be satisfied in the highest sense, and absolutely (to obtain food and drink).
(5) In the service of mercy, to devote our life to the wants of the world,	—To rest in the bosom of infinite mercy.
(6) Purity of heart: absolute renunciation of the world, death of our own will,	—To behold God. Absolute possession of all in this vision of God. Blessed enjoyment of this vision.
(7) To be peacemakers. To be sent and cast into every burning controver-	—The glory and beauty of the sons of God, or of those who are princes in His eter-

* We note here, how Sir Humphry Davy and Coccejus independently arrive at the same conclusion: "The usages and ceremonies which Moses instituted, appear to have been superadded to its spiritual worship, for the purpose of adapting that religion to a certain climate, and to the peculiar state of the Jewish people. They served rather as the garb of that religion, than as forming an essential part of it." We should rather say, that they were the legal and symbolical form of that religion,—a form in which even the moral law was clothed.

sy of the world. To descend as mediators to the very gates of hell,	nal kingdom. The vehicles of the blessing which cometh from God. Transformed into the image of the Son of God.
Generally:	
To suffer for righteousness' sake,	—Actual inward possession of the kingdom of heaven.
To suffer for Christ's sake,	—A new world: the eternal inheritance, the great reward in heaven.

6. The paradox exhibited in these contrasting statements, which probably comes out most distinctly in the first beatitude, indicates the relationship between Christianity and the world, and the judgment of the world generally. Christianity itself is that "foolishness of God" which is wiser than the wisdom of this world, and that truth of God which sweeps away the delusive appearances of the world (comp. 1 Cor. i. 17, etc.).

7. It is evident that the seven stages here described may be arranged under twice three stages, based upon poverty in spirit, and indicating a threefold relationship toward God and toward the world: 1, religious and moral relationship to God: mourning, hungering, and thirsting; purity of heart; 2, moral and religious relationship toward the world: meekness, mercy, peacemaking. But besides, it is important to notice how each of these stages is always the result of that which precedes it. Thus poverty in spirit leads to mourning; mourning renders meek; meekness obtains a view of eternal righteousness; hungering and thirsting after this righteousness renders infinitely merciful and compassionate; mercy surrenders everything, renounces all, and thus becomes purity of heart, which surrenders all, and devotes all. Purity of heart is the disposition requisite for the Divine commission of bringing peace into the world. The peacemakers necessarily suffer for righteousness' sake (Isa. lii. 7); and in measure as they apprehend the kingdom of love in its essential features, will they see and understand that all is but suffering for Christ's sake.

This progress from poverty in spirit to the highest stage of peacemaking and suffering for Christ's sake, is the effect of Divine grace acting upon and influencing the soul which is humbled under a sense of spiritual poverty. Accordingly, the first effect of beholding the kingdom of heaven, is to mourn.—Similarly, to be really comforted, leads to meekness.—The consciousness of special victory achieved by bearing wrong, issues in hungering and thirsting after righteousness.—Those who are satisfied are merciful, etc.

8. The Sermon on the Mount, which embodies the spiritual principles of the kingdom of heaven in all its bearings and aspects, may be compared with other forms of religious and moral legislation. In the passage succeeding it, a comparison is instituted between this new form of the eternal law and the law of Moses and the traditions of the Pharisees. Not that the Sermon on the Mount is a rectification, but a harmonious development, the continuation and application, of the law of God under the Old Covenant; while the contrast with traditionalism is strongly and markedly brought out. (On the relation between the Sermon on the Mount and the sayings of heathen sages, comp. Tholuck's *Commentary*. On the false application of the Sermon on the Mount to civic and political relationship, by Quakers and other sectaries, comp. Stier's *Discourses of Jesus*.)

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Glorious accomplishment of the prediction of Moses: "A Prophet like unto me," etc.; Deut. xviii. 15.—Mount Sinai, and the obscure, unknown Mount of Beatitudes.—The sacred mountains.—Import of the expression: "*He went up into a mountain.*" *—The law of the letter spiritually explained, and the law of the Spirit expressed in the letter.—Outward and inward tradition: Cain and Abel, Ishmael and Isaac, Esau and Jacob, Caiaphas and Christ.—The first and the second Sermon on the Mount, or the disciples and the people.—The place whence Christ taught, a symbol of Christian teaching: 1. A stone on the summit (let our doctrine be simple); 2. the summit of a mountain (let our doctrine be exalted); 3. a place of prayer (let it be holy, derived from heaven); 4. a place of pilgrimage (let it be from life, and for life).—"*He opened His mouth:*" this the completion of revelation.†—The Old Covenant with its ten commandments; the New with its seven beatitudes.—The law given by Moses: grace and truth appeared by Jesus Christ.—The one beatitude of Christians unfolding into seven beatitudes.—"*Blessed are:*" we must *be* blessed in order to *become* blessed.—Necessity of a state of grace in the kingdom of God. 1. Such a state is the condition of further attainments. 2. It precedes all gracious action.—The seven beatitudes marking *deepening humiliation.*—The seven beatitudes marking *growing exaltation.*—Correspondence of this humiliation and exaltation.—"*Blessed are the poor in spirit: for,*" etc. (Similarly each of the other beatitudes by itself furnishing a theme for precious meditation.)—The kingdom of heaven in its grand outlines: comfort, gain, satisfaction, enjoyment of mercy, vision of God, adoption into the family of God.—Or again, the kingdom of peace and of joy; of love and of meekness; of righteousness; of mercy; of blessed knowledge; of heavenly peacemaking and of glory.—Poverty in spirit the *fruit* of the law (of the Old Covenant), and the *germ* of the Gospel (of the New Covenant).—The crowning glory of the law is poverty in spirit.—The triumph of the law consists in that it makes poor; that of the Gospel, in that it makes rich.—A well-marked and definite state consists in a definite and well-marked tendency of mind and heart: poverty in spirit is longing for the entire kingdom of heaven.—A view of the kingdom of heaven in its nearness leads to mourning.—He who has been comforted by a manifestation of the kingdom of heaven, becomes meek.—Victory over men and the earth leads to hungering and thirsting after the righteousness of God.—If we have been satisfied in the house of God, we shall learn to be merciful.—He who reposes on eternal mercy may well surrender all, and be pure in heart.—One glimpse of this vision of God converts man into a messenger

* [Chr. Wordsworth, *in Matt.* v. 1: "Christ had four places of spiritual retirement from the bustle of the world—all, in a certain sense, exemplary: 1. τὴν ἔρημον, for fasting and temptation, conflict with Satan. 2. τὸ ὄρος, for prayer, teaching, miraculous feeding, transfiguration, finally ascension. 3. τὸ πλοῖον (type of the Church), for teaching and miracles. 4. The *garden* of Gethsemane. agony."—P. S.]

† [Dr. Wordsworth, quoting from the fathers on ἀνοίξας τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ: "He who before had opened the mouth of Moses and all the Prophets, now opens His own mouth,—He who had taught the world by them concerning Himself, now teaches in His own Person—God with us, and He delivers in the Sermon on the Mount a perfect code of Christian Duty."—P. S.]

of peace. 1. He has seen the peace of the Spirit, and carries it to other spirits; 2. he has seen the peace of the blessed, and brings it to men; 3. he has seen the peace of nature, and introduces it into society.—The children of God, the image of the Son of God.—The righteousness of the kingdom of heaven springing from a sevenfold sense of unrighteousness: poverty, mourning, etc.—To suffer for righteousness' sake, is to suffer for Christ's sake, and *vice versâ*.—Holy suffering the most glorious doing: 1. As the crown and seal of every deed of faith; 2. as the victory over temptation to evil-doing; 3. as the victory over the evil deeds of men; 4. as a testimony to the deed of God.—"*Falsely*," or "*for My sake*."—It is only if we really suffer for His sake that the Lord charges Himself with it.—Blessed are they which are persecuted for Christ's sake.—Even revilers contribute to our blessedness.—Christians as companions of the prophets, 1. in their sufferings; 2. in their blessedness.—The persecutions of the world designed to prepare believers for being the salt of the earth and the light of the world.—The disciples of the Lord, the salt of the earth, the light of the world.—The disciples are to be the *salt of the earth*, 1. by consuming death, 2. by preventing corruption, 3. by promoting life.—If the salt have lost its savor, nothing can remedy the evil; so also with a dead profession, and a dead ministry.—Salt that has lost its savor is cast on the great road of life, as exemplified, 1. by heathen antiquity, 2. by theocratic Judaism, 3. by mediæval traditionalism.—The disciples of the Lord the *light of the world* through the great light of heaven.—Only in the light of the Lord can we diffuse light.—The Church of God a *city set on a hill*.—The candle of the ministry in the house of God.—The candle is not to be put under the bushel, but on a candlestick: (*a*) Not under the bushel of the letter merely, or of officialism, or of our limited understanding, or of our narrow sympathies; but (*b*) on the candlestick of a sound confession, of ecclesiastical order, of spiritual liberty, and of a Christian life.—The stake of martyrs the lofty candlestick of the Church.—*Let your light shine*, 1. to enlighten men, 2. to throw light on Christian works, 3. to glorify the Father of lights (James i.).—Our Father in heaven is glorified by poverty in spirit, 1. because He bestows it; 2. because it leads to Him; 3. because in Him it obtains the kingdom of heaven.

Starke:—Christ will give us also a mouth and wisdom, Luke xxi. 15.—A preacher must open his mouth without fear or hesitation; confess the truth without being afraid; nor spare any one, whoever he be, Isa. lviii. 1.—The larger the audience, and the more anxious it is, the more gladly should the preacher open his mouth.—It ought to be the great concern of man to obtain eternal life, Phil. ii. 12.—By pride have we fallen from the kingdom of God, and by humility must we again enter it, James iv. 16.—God bestows all in return for all, or rather, in return for nothing.—The greater our faith, the deeper our humility.—The more wretched a man is in his own eyes, the more exalted and acceptable is he in the sight of God.—Sufferings borne for the sake of God, and tears shed for our own sins and for those of our neighbors (Ps. cxix. 136) are the well-spring of true comfort, Isa. lxi. 3.—The comfort of man only increases our sorrow, Job xvi. 2; but Divine consolation makes the heart joyous and assured, Ps. xciv. 19.—Meekness builds up, while hot and rash zeal pulls down.—The ungodly have no title to their possessions in this world, and death shall at last deprive them of all, Ps. xlix. 18.—Luther: Where real hunger and earnestness are awanting, fair appearances will lead to no result.—True hunger seeks for that which affords nourishment and satisfaction.—Whoever showeth mercy shall obtain fresh mercy from God.—You forgive a small error, but God will forgive all your sins. But woe to the unmerciful, James ii. 13; Matt. xxv. 42; Luke xvi. 25.—By nature no man is pure in heart, Jer. xvii. 9; Gen. viii. 21; Prov. xx. 9: God creates it in us, Ps. li. 12.—Without holiness no man can see the Lord, Heb. xii. 14.—Happy he who, having been born blind, obtains his sight; but more blessed by far the man who, being born spiritually blind, is enabled to see God, Rev. iii. 17, 18.—Those who love to quarrel, to dispute, and to make strife, are the children of the devil.—It is a sign that we are the children of God, if we love peace and advance it.—Not only what we do, but what we suffer, is a fruit of faith, Heb. xi. 33, 36.—Believers are hated, reviled, and persecuted on account of the things for which they should be loved and blessed, John x. 32.—Persecution for righteousness' sake has a great reward.—The more painful to flesh and blood the preaching of the cross, the more readily should it be received, Luke ix. 44.—Luther: What comfort that the Son of God Himself calls us blessed, let whoever may speak ill of us! 1 Cor. iv. 3-5.—Christians, and especially ministers, must submit to reviling and persecution: this has always been the lot of the Church; nor is it a good sign when a servant of God is without it, Gal. vi. 12.—The Church is preserved despite the fury of Satan.—Let persecutors rage, since Christ offers us such blessed comfort.—He who in his inmost heart rejoices not in the cross of Christ, is not worthy of Him, James i. 2.—To be reviled and persecuted by the world for conscience' sake, is to be commended and crowned, Rev. ii. 10.—By suffering we enter into communion with the prophets and the Lord Jesus Himself.—The inheritance of the saints is in heaven.—Teachers are not only to have salt in themselves, but also to make right use of their salt, so as to apply neither too much nor too little of the pungent, 1 Tim. iv. 16.—When the children and servants of God remain stedfast under persecutions, they prove themselves good salt; but if they give way, the salt has lost its savor.—While attempting to avoid persecution, we shall all the more expose ourselves to it.—Believers should be united, that the world may recognize a visible Church, Heb. x. 29.—The eyes of all are set upon religious men, especially upon those who are teachers, and placed over a church: if they act in accordance with their profession, many are edified; if otherwise, the scandal is all the greater, 2 Cor. vi. 3.—Every Christian must be anxious to bring others to the light and knowledge of the truth, Luke xxii. 32.—A candle does not put itself upon a candlestick, neither does a minister take upon himself the sacred office, Eph. iv. 11.—He who hides the grace of sanctification, shall lose it.—Blessed the household over which even *one* believing soul sheds its light.—Faith alone leads to truly good works.—Faith does not stop to inquire whether it is necessary to do good works: it is its nature to manifest itself in good works.—The grand object of good works is the glory of God, 1 Cor. x. 31.

Lisco:—In the kingdom of Christ, possession of the world is attained, not by might, but by meekness.—What the sun is to this world as the light of

the earth, that the disciples of Christ should be to mankind generally.

Gerlach:—The first four beatitudes apply to those who are seeking; the last, to those who know how to preserve what they have found.—The meek shall inherit the earth. Possession of his inheritance commences, *spiritually*, immediately, since all things belong to believers, and all contributes to their salvation (1 Cor. iii. 21–23; Rom. viii. 28). But it also literally commences *on earth*, since the Church of God outlasts all the kingdoms of this world (Dan. vii. 17, 18), and is destined to become the most extensive kingdom of this world. Lastly, it shall be *fully* accomplished, when Christ, who is our life, shall appear, and we shall appear with Him in glory.—The highest reward of love to God, is the love of God.—If salt is pungent, it is also savory; if light penetrate and reveal, it also quickens and revives: similarly the servants whom the Lord has furnished for His own work.

Heubner:—If we would listen to the Saviour, we also must ascend with Him from what is earthly to what is heavenly.—On the manifestations of God witnessed in sacred mountains.—When Jesus opens His mouth let us open our hearts.—*Luther* on the passage: These are the three points which go to make a good preacher: He must come boldly forward; 2. he must open his mouth before all men, and say something worth hearing; 3. he must know when and where to stop.*—Spiritual poverty, Ps. xxxiv. 19; li. 19; Isa. xli. 17; liv. 6; lvii. 25; lxi. 1; lxvi. 2.—Humility stands at the top of all the Beatitudes.—Luther: It is the prerogative of God to make something out of nothing.—To be destitute of spiritual poverty, is to be destitute of all practical religion.—*Augustine*, Enarr. *in Ps.* cxxxvi.: "multi flent fletu Babylonio, quia et gaudent gaudio Babylonio. Qui gaudent lucris et flent damnis, utrumque de Babylonia est. Flere debes sed recordando Sion."—Let us always bear in mind Rev. vii. 17, and xxi. 4: "God will wipe away all tears from their eyes." But how can we hope to enjoy this blessed privilege, if we have not actually shed tears on earth?—Spiritual hungering and thirsting an evidence of spiritual health.—It is our highest honor to bear the cross of Christ.—We shall be rendered perfect by enduring affliction.—The gradation here indicated is absolutely necessary; not one of the steps may safely be left out.—Vers. 12. (Pericope.) The order of grace, or of beatitude: 1. It commences with repentance (vers. 3–5); 2. it rests on faith (ver. 6); 3. it requires continual sanctification (vers. 7–9); 4. it is evidenced by suffering (10–12).

* [If I remember rightly, Luther once gave this homiletical advice (derived from the words: *He opened His mouth*) in a more pointed form than Heubner, viz.: *Tritt frisch auf; thu 's Maul auf; hör bald auf!* *i. e.*, "Get up boldly; open the mouth widely; be done quickly."—P. S.]

II.

The doctrine and righteousness of Christ the genuine development and fulfilment of the Old Testament, as being the true and absolute fulfilment of the law in contradistinction to spurious traditionalism, or the ossification and perversion of the law exhibited in the righteousness of the Pharisees and scribes, in respect both of their teaching and in their practice. Christ and Moses; Christ and traditionalism. —*Descent from the Mount of Divine Revelation to the arbitrary dispensations and ordinances of man.* Ch. v. 17–ch. vii. 6.

(Ch. v. 20–26, the Gospel for the 6th Sunday after Trinity.—Ch. vi. 24–34, the Gospel for the 15th Sunday after Trinity.)

1. *Christ and the Law; or, Christ the absolute fulfilment.*

Chapter V. 17–19.

17 Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to
18 destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or
19 one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. Whosoever there-
fore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be
called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach *them*, the
same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 17. **Think not**, μὴ νομίσητε.—The choice of the expression, νομίζειν, in connection with the word νόμος immediately following, must not be overlooked. The verb implies: to recognize as use and custom—to be accustomed, to think, to imagine (to suppose according to custom). Hence the expression here points to a legal prejudice: Do not suppose that I am come to destroy the law.*

The connection between this and what precedes, is

* [German: *das Gesetz zu entsetzen*, which might perhaps be rendered: *to illegalise* or *to outlaw the law*.—P. S.]

evident, although Meyer denies it. Immediately before, Jesus had spoken of persecution for righteousness' sake and for His sake. This implied a contrast between His righteousness and that of the Pharisees and scribes. Accordingly, the question would naturally arise as to the relation between His doctrine of the kingdom of heaven, the law, and the Old Testament generally, since the disciples could not, at the time, have been fully alive to the contrast between Jewish traditionalism and the law of Moses. Evidently the prejudice might arise in their minds, that Jesus intended to destroy the law.

This difficulty is immediately met by the declaration, that He was come, **not to destroy, but to fulfil the law;** nay that he was Himself its fulfilment, and that not merely in respect of its types, but of all the symbols of truth which were afloat among men, whether specially Jewish, or in heathen religions, or even of those presented by history and nature generally. Still, we must bear in mind that Matthew always chiefly points to the fulfilment of the Old Testament in Christ. The idea of an absolute fulfilment of all types, is brought out in the Gospel by John.

The law, or the prophets.—Not merely the Pentateuch as a book, or the prophets as the other portions of the Old Testament, but also the gradual spiritual development of Old Testament revelation which they embody. The ἢ is never used for καί, but always as a particle of distinction (comp. Winer, *Gram. of the N. T.*; Fritzsche *ad Marc.*, p. 276 sqq.). "In the present instance it means, to abrogate the one, or the other." The Jews were guilty of various kinds of abrogation of the law. The Sadducees destroyed the prophets, the Pharisees the law, the Essenes, in part, both the law and the prophets. But Christ preserved the Old Testament in all its entirety, and fulfilled it in its deepest meaning. As everywhere else, so here, the word νόμος refers to the *whole* law, and not merely to the Decalogue; although we recognize in the Old Testament a manifest distinction between the moral law, the ceremonial law, and the national or civil law. The ceremonial was intended to supplement the moral law; while the civil law supplemented both, and formed their basis. "The special quotations from the moral law which are afterward adduced by the Saviour, are only intended as examples of the whole law (or of what was most important)—consisting of some of those moral precepts which would most readily occur in the circumstances. He fulfilled the *whole* law,—not the smallest ceremonial or national ordinance being destroyed in its ultimate idea, while everything which the law prescribed, and of which the ancient ordinances were only the στοιχεῖα, was carried out to its full ideal" (Meyer). "The expression, τοὺς προφήτας, cannot possibly refer to the predictions contained in their writings (the Greek Fathers: Beza, Calovius, and others,—among them, Tholuck and Neander), as nobody would imagine that the Messiah would destroy *them*. Taken in connection with the νόμος (comp. also ch. vii. 12; xxii. 40), it must refer to the injunctions of the prophetic writings." But carnal Judaizers might regard the contrast between the life of Jesus and their fanciful and secularized views of what the language of the prophets conveyed, as destroying not only the law, but the prophets.

To destroy, καταλῦσαι,—in the sense of abrogating, a revolutionary destruction of existing institutions.

But to fulfil, ἀλλὰ πληρῶσαι.—The expression is differently interpreted, as meaning: 1. actually to fulfil (Elsner, Wolf, Bleek, and others); 2. to complete doctrinally, = τελειῶσαι, to interpret more fully, to perfect, *i. e.*, to bring out its spiritual meaning (Lightfoot, Hammond, etc.); 3. combining the two views: to make perfect as doctrine, and to exhibit perfectly in the life. In adopting the latter interpretation, we must keep in mind that this πλήρωσις is not to be understood as implying that an imperfect revelation was to be completed, but that a preliminary and typical revelation was to be presented in all its fulness, and completely realized by word and deed. [Dr. Wordsworth: "Christ fulfilled the law and the prophets by obedience, by accomplishment of types, ceremonies, rites, and prophecies, and by explaining, spiritualizing, elevating, enlarging, and perfecting the moral law, by writing it on the *heart*, and by giving *grace* to obey it, as well as an example of obedience, by taking away its curse; and by the doctrine of free justification by faith in Himself, which the law prefigured and anticipated, but could not give." Augustine: "*Ante* Christi adventum lex *jubebat*, non *juvabat*; post, et *jubet* et *juvat*." Maldonatus: "Abolet non *dissolvendo* sed *absolvendo*, non *delendo* sed *perficiendo*.—P. S.]

Ver. 18. **For verily,** ἀμὴν γάρ; אָמֵן ἀληθῶς,—a solemn asseveration, used to introduce important announcements. In such cases, St. John* always repeated the word.

Till heaven and earth shall pass away.—1. In the sense of *never*: Calvin, Luther, Zwingle, etc.,—heaven and earth being regarded as everlasting: Baruch iii. 32, comp. Luke xvi. 17. 2. *To the end of the world*: Paulus, Tholuck. The law shall last till a new order of things shall be introduced. Proof: According to the New Testament, heaven and earth are to pass away. The old and symbolical shape and arrangements of this world shall pass away sooner than the old symbolical law, just as the extremities of the body die before the centre, or the heart. But the law can only pass away in the letter by being accomplished in the spirit and in truth. Viewed as a shadow and type of things to come, the law disappears in Christ; but as to its substance, it is part of the word of God, and as such it abideth for ever, even in heaven.

The **Iota** refers to the smallest Hebrew letter י; the **tittle,** κεραία, to a still smaller mark, by which similar-looking letters were distinguished, or else to the little dot inserted in the י. The meaning is,

* [The Edinb. translator here erroneously substitutes *the Baptist* for the Evangelist. Matthew, Mark, and Luke, in the discourses of the Saviour, uniformly (in more than 50 passages) use the *single* ἀμήν, while the Saviour, in the Gospel of John, always (in 24 passages) uses the *double* ἀμήν (a Hebrew *epizeuxis*, or emphatic repetition of the same word, comp. מְאֹד מְאֹד). *See* John i. 51 (52); iii. 3, 5, 11; v. 19, 24, 25; vi. 26, 32, 47, 53; viii. 34, 51, 58, etc. etc. The uniformity of this usage in the mouth of the Saviour, and the *Saviour only*, is significant. Tholuck, Olshausen, de Wette, and Meyer state the fact, but attempt no explanation. Bengel (*Gnomon* ad Joh. i. 51) accounts for it on the ground that the Saviour spoke in the name of the Father and in His own, and adds that at the time when the first three Gospels were written it was not yet seasonable to record the double ἀμήν, and the argument for the Divinity of Christ implied in it. I venture to suggest that John, or rather Christ himself, desired to emphasize the fact that He was the absolute, the personal Truth, as He says, John xiv. 6, or the *Amen*, as He is called, Rev. iii. 14. For no one else in the N. T. ventures to use the phrase: VERILY (not even once) *I say unto you*.—P. S.]

that the most delicate and apparently smallest determinations and distinctions were to be preserved in the delicate and finer outlines of spiritual life.

Till all be fulfilled.—Thus the law has a twofold termination, a negative and a positive. Negatively, it terminates with the old world; positively, it is realized in the new and spiritual world, now inaugurated. Comp. Luke xvi. 17.

Ver. 19. **Whosoever therefore shall break,** ὃς ἐὰν οὖν λύσῃ.—In the Conj. Aor., indicating what may take place at some future period (the possible *futurum exactum*). The term used is λύσῃ, not καταλύσῃ, since, according to the Divine arrangement, none could in the old world achieve the καταλῦσαι of the law.

One of these least commandments; referring to the **iota** and **tittle.**—The expression, *least*, does not apply to the pharisaical distinction between great and small commandments (according to Wetstein), but to the difference made by the Lord Himself, between the law generally and its iota and tittle. "Such a person is not entirely excluded from the kingdom, because his opposition is not one of principle, nor directed against the law itself, but only against its minutiæ."—Meyer.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The *humility* and *majesty* of Christ in defining his relation to the law. He declares at once his subordination to the Old Testament, and his superiority over it.

2. Christ destroys nothing but sin, which indeed destroys itself. All that is divine in this world, nay, even all that is truly human, He elevates and spiritualizes. Thus Christ is the absolute fulfilment of the Old Testament and of the old world—and that, both in His life and doctrine. "All that is transient—it is only a likeness, incomplete here—but reality there." *—"Generally, and in every respect, I have come, not to destroy aught that is right or true: the object of My advent has been to preserve, to carry on, and to perfect every commencement, preparation for, and expectancy of, the kingdom of God throughout humanity. Thus the Saviour lifts His eyes beyond Israel on the heathen world, for whose sake also He has come, and where his advent marks a fulfilment of spiritual aspirations, which, though dim, were already in existence, and only waited for their unfolding and accomplishment. He looks into the depths of humanity, as opened up before Him, and views all history in its highest import as tending toward, and as expectancy of, Himself."—Stier.

3. The fulfilment of the law and prophets is implied in the appearance of Jesus: it has been carried out in His life; it is still developing in His Church; and will continue until it becomes perfectly manifest in the reappearing of Christ, or the manifestation of the new order of things, of which He is the centre.

4. "There is a fulfilment of the law in its *mere* letter, which is really a transgression of the law, as expressed in that true saying: *summum jus, summa injuria.* On the other hand, there is a transgression of the letter of the law, which may be a fulfilment of its spirit."—Tholuck (p. 148). We add, that there is a seeming destruction of the old, which, in reality, is its fulfilment; while its *spurious* preservation implies real destruction.

5. The Lord here sets before us the contrast, not between entire opposition to the law and its perfect fulfilment, but between partial opposition and perfect fulfilment. To attempt destroying the law entirely, were to be an enemy of the kingdom of heaven, and hence beyond its pale. But even the attempt to destroy it partially in its least, but, at the same time, most delicate injunctions, brings down the punishment of being called least in the kingdom of heaven. So far as it goes, every such destruction is a revolution, not a reform. "He shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven, because his spirit is least capacious, and because he finds it impossible to realize the life of the law without surrendering its special directions, and confining himself to a few abstract principles."—*Leben Jesu*, ii. 2, p. 593.

6. The order which Christ establishes, is that of doing and teaching, not the reverse. But this order of life becomes a disorder, where doing and teaching have a negative tendency. If, on the contrary, we do and teach the law in a proper spirit, we shall be the means by which Christ fulfils and accomplishes His regeneration and transformation of the world. Hence we shall also be called great in the kingdom of heaven.

7. In connection with this subject, we recall to mind the various antinomian tendencies; not merely those in direct opposition to the law, but such, when, under the guise of obedience, the spirit of the law was contravened. The context shows that our Lord referred to the latter as well as to the former. For nothing is more revolutionary than rigid and tyrannical traditionalism.

8. Jesus carefully guards Himself against the suspicion that He was about violently to put an end to the Old Dispensation and the ancient theocratic order of things. The same line of argument was, at a later period, adopted by the Apostle Paul, when defending himself against a similar charge, Rom. iii. 31. When Paul speaks of the abrogation of the law, he always refers only to its temporary, transient, and traditional form (Eph. ii. 15; Col. ii. 14). In this sense the law must pass away, in order that its real nature as the law of the spirit may appear.—But it is important to remember, that in this passage the Lord passed over the abolition of outward and temporary ordinances, while He laid emphasis upon the fulfilment of the law in the Gospel, and that not merely for the purpose of rebutting the antinomian expectations hitherto entertained, as if the revelation of the kingdom of heaven implied the destruction of the law. We rather conceive that His argument was mainly directed against the popular prejudice, that He intended to detract from the character and obligations of the law.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Even on His first appearance, Christ felt that He would be represented as a rebel and destroyer of the authority of the law.—Against such suspicions He solemnly protested.—Christ has guarded His Gospel and His Church from the suspicion of revolutionary tendencies.—The old error, which seeks to identify the religion of the Spirit with rebellion, as appearing, 1. in the history of Christ; 2. in that of His Church.—

* [Allusion to the mysterious conclusion of the second art of Goethe's *Faust:*

"Alles Vergaengliche ist nur ein Gleichniss;
Das Unzulaengliche hier wird's Ereigniss;
Das Unbegreifliche hier wird's gethan;
Das ewig Weibliche zieht uns hinan."—P. S.]

Christ the fulfiller of the law.—The law and the prophets.—The absolute fulfilment: 1. in His doctrine; 2. in His life; 3. in His history; 2 Cor. i. 20; Heb. xiii. 8.—Import of the name of Jehovah, Rev. i. 4.—The law in its essence is eternal.—The law must be fulfilled in all its parts: 1. As spiritual requirement, which must be spiritually accomplished; 2. as an emblem of the Spirit, which is to be realized by the Spirit; 3. as a promise of the Spirit, which the Spirit will fulfil.—Every sacred emblem has its corresponding reality in the kingdom of Christ.—Christ has fulfilled the law: 1. The moral law by His obedience; 2. the sacrificial law by His sufferings; 3. the civil or national law by His institutions.—Even the laws and emblems of our lives must become reality.—The law fulfilled by the manifestation of the spirit of the law, since the Spirit brings out, 1. the one grand principle of the law, instead of its many injunctions; 2. the life of the law in the individual; 3. reveals the infinite depth of the law.—The law is transformed and glorified in its fulfilment.—A mere carnal observance of the letter may in reality be an abrogation of the law.—To resist the spiritual unfolding of the law, is, under the guise of allegiance, to rebel against its authority.—The Gospel presents the law in its spiritual aspect.—He who, by his interpretations of the law, attempts to make the kingdom of heaven small, cannot himself be great in the kingdom of heaven.—Grandeur of free obedience.—Doing and teaching: such is the order of Christ.—The righteousness of Christ, and that of the Pharisees and scribes.

Starke:—The word of God abideth for ever, Luke xvi. 17.—There is no commandment of God too small to be obeyed, James ii. 10.

Gerlach:—The law was essentially spiritual; but on account of the hardness of the Jewish heart, it was fenced in under the Old Testament by outward ordinances, which, for the time, prevented the full manifestation of its depth. Hence, in order to "fulfil it," Christ broke through the barriers, and thus unfolded its true glory; while the Pharisees contravened the spirit of the law by the observance of its letter, which in reality destroyed, instead of fulfilling it.

---

2. *Relation between the Doctrine of Christ and the Law; and between the latter and the Doctrine of the Pharisees and Scribes, or Jewish Traditionalism, as exhibited in five special instances,—showing the spurious in opposition to the genuine development of the Law, its narrowing by the letter, and its fulness in the spirit.*

Chapter V. 20–48.

(*Ch. V. 20–26, the Gospel for the 6th Sunday after Trinity.*)

20 For I say unto you, That except your righteousness shall exceed *the righteousness*
of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven.
21 Ye have heard that it was said by [to][1] them of old time, Thou shalt not kill; and
22 whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment: But I say unto [to] you, That
whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause [without cause][2] shall be in
danger of the judgment: and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in
danger of the council: but [and] whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of
23 hell fire. Therefore if thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy
24 brother hath aught against thee; Leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy
25 way; first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift. Agree with
thine adversary quickly, while thou art in the way with him; lest at any time the adversary deliver thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and thou be
26 cast into prison. Verily I say unto thee, Thou shalt by no means come out thence, till
thou hast paid the uttermost farthing.
27 Ye have heard that it was said by [to] them of old time,[3] Thou shalt not commit
28 adultery: But I say unto [to] you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her
29 hath committed adultery with her already in his heart. And if thy right eye offend
thee [cause thee to offend], pluck it out, and cast *it* from thee: for it is profitable for
thee that one of thy members should perish, and not *that* thy whole body should be
30 cast into hell. And if thy right hand offend thee [cause thee to offend], cut it off, and
cast *it* from thee: for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish,
31 and not *that* thy whole body should be cast [depart, ἀπέλθῃ] into hell. It hath been
said, Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement:
32 But I say unto you, That whosoever shall put away his wife, saving [save] for the
cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery: and whosoever shall marry her
that is divorced committeth adultery.

33 Again, ye have heard that it hath been said by [to] them of old time, Thou shalt
34 not forswear thyself [swear falsely], but shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths: But
35 I say unto you, Swear not at all; neither by heaven; for it is God's throne: Nor by
the earth; for it is his footstool; neither by Jerusalem; for it is the city of the great
36 King. Neither shalt thou swear by thy head, because thou canst not make one hair
37 white or black. But let your communication [word, λόγος] be, Yea, yea; Nay, nay:
for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil.
38 Ye have heard that it hath been said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth:
39 But I say unto you, That ye resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right
40 cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take
41 away thy coat, let him have *thy* cloak also. And whosoever shall compel [impress]
42 thee to go a mile, go with him twain [two]. Give to him that asketh thee, and from
him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away.
43 Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbour, and hate
44 thine enemy. But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do
good to them that hate you,[4] and pray for them which [who] despitefully use you,
45 and[5] persecute you; That ye may be the children of your Father which [who] is in
heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain
46 on the just and on the unjust. For if ye love them which love you, what reward have
47 ye? do not even the publicans the same? And if ye salute your brethren only, what
do ye more *than others* [that excels, τί περισσόν]? do not even the publicans [the
48 heathen][6] so? Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which [who] is in heaven
is perfect.

[1] Ver. 21.—[Τοῖς ἀρχαίοις, *to the ancients*, is the interpretation of the Greek fathers, the ancient versions, and all the English versions from Wiclif's to the Genevan incl., and also that of Rheims. This is certainly much more natural than the rare and mostly questionable *ablative* use of the dative case, which Beza, in his later editions, preferred, and which passed into the E. V. of 1611. Bengel (*Gnomon* in loc.) remarks: "Antitheton, *vobis;* unde patet, τοῖς ἀρχαίοις, *antiquis* (patribus, tempore Mosis) non esse casu sexto: faciliorque est constructio: *dictum est antiquis*, id est, *ad antiquos*, quam *ab antiquis*." The word ἐῤῥήθη is always followed in the N. T. or the Septuagint by the substantive which denotes the person *to whom* (not *by whom*) the words were spoken, comp. Rom. ix. 12, 26; Gal. iii. 16; Rev. vi. 11; ix. 4. Comp. also Com.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 22.—Εἰκῆ, *without cause*, omitted by Cod. B., several minuscule MSS., translations, and fathers. [Lachmann and Tischendorf omit it, and Tregelles marks it as very doubtful. Alford retains it, and there is sufficient ancient authority for it to justify its continuance in the *popular* translations.—P. S.]

[3] Ver. 27.—[The critical authorities are against τοῖς ἀρχαίοις of the text. rec. in this verse, and throw it out of the text. But Dr. Lange retains it in his transl. Comp. vers. 31, 33, and 43, where these words are likewise omitted.—P. S.]

[4] Ver. 44.—[The clauses of the received text: "*bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you*," are marked as doubtful by Griesbach, and omitted in the modern critical editions; but they are genuine in the parallel passage, Luke vi. 27, 28. Hence Dr. Lange retains them here in his translation.—P. S.]

[5] Ver. 44.—The words: "*which despitefully use you and* [τῶν ἐπηρεαζόντων ὑμᾶς καί] are omitted by some authorities. [Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Alford omit them, and Meyer is disposed to regard them as an interpolation from Luke vii. 28.—P. S.]

[6] Ver. 47.—[Dr. Lange translates: *die Heiden, the heathen*, following the reading: οἱ ἐθνικοί (Vulgata: *ethnici*), which is better authenticated in ver. 47 than τελῶναι, *publicani*. The latter seems to have been taken from ver. 46 where τελῶναι is universally sustained. *See* Tischend., Lachm., Tregelles, and Alford *ad loc.*—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

General Remarks on the whole Section.—(1) Real abolition of the law under guise of rendering its injunctions more rigid; hedging in of the law in its spirituality and perfectness by the traditions of the scribes and Pharisees, resulting in perversion of doctrine by converting the law into a series of outward and finite ordinances.

First Instance: Abrogation of the law through observance of the letter, by the conversion of a moral precept into a purely civil law, thus secularizing it, *and destroying its spirit*—as shown in the traditions connected with the commandment: "*Thou shalt not kill.*" *Second Instance:* Abrogation of the law by *weakening its force*, and converting a limited permission *into an encouragement*—as shown in the traditions connected with the commandment: "*Thou shalt not commit adultery.*" *Third Instance:* Abrogation of the law by the *perversion* of a solemn asseveration into a common mode of assurance, or into cursing—as exhibited in the injunctions connected *with oaths*. *Fourth Instance: Abrogation of the law* by the conversion of an ordinance of criminal law intended to put an end to private vengeance into a moral law, which, in reality, sanctioned vengeance—as shown in *the law of retaliation*. *Fifth Instance:* Abolition of the law by sectarian interpretation and false inferences—as exhibited in connection with the great commandment: "*Thou shalt love thy neighbor.*"

(2) In opposition to these perversions, we have *five instances of the fulfilment of the law by the teaching of Christ*, in each of which the law is traced back to the *mind* and *heart*, or to the moral and religious *life* generally. In the first of the above instances, the law is traced back to the passion of anger; in the second, to adulterous desires; in the third, to the sinful want of reverence; in the fourth, to yielding to the power of evil; in the fifth, to selfishness and sectarianism, which are incompatible

with the requirements of universal love. In reference to the *first* of these instances, the Lord requireth from us brotherly feeling; in reference to the *second*, He demandeth sanctity in the relationship between the sexes; in reference to the *third*, calm assurance in the fear of God, so that our "yea be yea, and our nay nay;" in reference to the *fourth*, meekness and mercy, which overcometh injuries; while in reference to the *fifth*, He points out the infinitude of love.

(3) In all these examples, Christ shows that, viewed as a principle, in its true import and bearing, the law goes far beyond the mere letter, demanding not only a definite outward compliance, but reaching also the mind and heart. This boundless extent of the law in its application to the inner man is here presented in a definite form, and as special precepts; which, however, must not be interpreted literally, but regarded as so many symbols designed to illustrate the spirituality and depth of the law. Thus the *carnal literalism* and perversion of truth which appear in the rabbinical interpretation of "*Thou shalt not kill*," is met by a more literal yet infinitely deeper application of the commandment. *The dull stupidity of their literalism is met, so to speak, by a certain irony of literality.* Similarly, the lustfulness which was legalized by the cunning perversion of the commandment, "*Thou shalt not commit adultery*," is met by an uncompromising demand of the most complete self-denial. In opposition to the third perversion of the law, by which *that which was holy was thoughtlessly and sinfully dragged down*, we have here a majestic prohibition uttered in the name of the highest authority. Instead of the *spirit of strife*, fostered by an abuse of the principle of retaliation, the Saviour inculcates readiness to surrender even our own rights; while, lastly, the national pride and narrow sectarianism of the Pharisees were to give place to the influences of a love so wide, as to break through all the narrow bounds of bigotry. Thus Jesus refutes the literalism of the scribes by literality; and shows that even in its *literal interpretation*, the letter of the law was from the first only the symbol of its spirit.

Ver. 20. **Except your righteousness shall exceed,** *etc.*, *ἐὰν μὴ περισσεύσῃ*.—The general idea, *to be better*, or *to excel*, does not exhaust the expression, which implies to grow up beyond the righteousness of the scribes—to exceed it. The antithesis lies in the statement, that the Pharisees have all their reward here, while the righteousness of the kingdom of heaven is not only *lasting*, but extends to the kingdom of glory. The word δικαιοσύνη does not merely refer to righteousness by faith, but in general to the righteousness of the kingdom of heaven as a principle, both in respect of doctrine and of life.

The directions here given by the Lord are manifestly not intended by way of improvement upon the law (Maldonatus and others), but as expressing its *true fulfilment* in opposition to its destruction by the traditions of the Pharisees. At first sight, it might appear as if Christ were setting aside the letter of the Old Testament; while in reality He only refutes the literalism of tradition, by which the true import of the law was perverted. Against every other abrogation of the law, the Lord protested on every occasion.

Ver. 21. **By them,** or more correctly: **To those of old, or to the ancients,** *τοῖς ἀρχαίοις*.—Beza, Schöttgen, [our authorized version], and others, render, "*by them of old*." But this interpretation is evidently strained, nor does it bring out the antithesis in the words of our Lord, "**But I say unto you.**" *They of old*, or *the ancients*, are evidently the old recipients of tradition, the Jewish synagogue,—not the Lawgiver himself. The reference to traditionalism in the word *ἐῤῥέθη* is peculiarly apt. It were impossible to fix upon any one who had first propounded these traditions; they rather originated from the general spirit of interpretation common in the synagogue.*

Thou shalt not kill, Ex. xx. 13.—To this the traditions of the scribes added, "*And whosoever shall kill*," etc.—a gloss which destroyed the spiritual and moral character of the law, and converted it into a rigid and merely external legal enactment. For, in the addition made by the scribes, the term *kill* manifestly referred only to actual murder; thus implying that the law itself applied only to the outward act of murder.—**Shall be in danger of the judgment:** *κρίσις*, which, according to ver. 22, was subject to the Sanhedrim. Every town had such a local court, the *Council of Seven* (consisting, according to the rabbins, of twenty-three members), which had the power of pronouncing sentence upon crimes, and of inflicting execution by the sword (Joseph. *Ant.* iv. 8, 14; Deut. xvi. 18). The Sanhedrim, or the *Council of Seventy*, alone had authority to pronounce sentence of stoning, or to adjudicate in cases of grievous heresy and of blasphemy.

Ver. 22. The word *εἰκῆ* (omitted in Cod. B, and by some of the Fathers) is not of doubtful authority; at any rate, it would have to be mentally supplied, as the Scriptures do not condemn anger on proper occasions, or moral indignation (*see* Eph. iv. 26; the example of the Lord and His parables).† The passage not only condemns unjust anger, but also the want of love.—By the term **brother,** our Lord referred not merely to Jews, but to our neighbors generally.—**Raca.** Variously interpreted as, 1. A mere interjection by way of reproach; 2. רֵיקָא, *empty head!* a common term of reproach at the time. (*See* Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.*; also Ewald, who derives it from the Aramæan רקעא, and renders it *blackguard.*) 3. From רָקַק, *to spit out*—the prolonged imperative: *Spit out*, used

* [Dr. Alford, *ad loc.*: "Meyer (ed. 2) has well observed [Dr. Bengel did it before him] that *ἐῤῥήθη τοῖς ἀρχαίοις* corresponds to λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν, and the ἐγώ to the understood subject of *ἐῤῥ.* He has not, however, apprehended the deeper truth which underlies the omission of the subject of *ἐῤῥ.*, that it was the *same Person* who said both. It will be noticed that our Lord does not here speak against the *abuse* of the law by tradition, but that every instance here given is either from *the law itself*, or *such traditional teaching as was in accordance with it.* The contrasts here are not between *the law misunderstood* and *the law rightly understood*, but between *the law and its ancient exposition*, which in their letter, and as given, were *κενά*—and *the same as spiritualised, πεπληρωμένα, by Christ*; not between *two lawgivers*, Moses and Christ, but between *οἱ ἀρχαῖοι* and *ὑμεῖς*; between (the idea is Chrysostom's) the children by the same husband, of the *bondwoman* and of the *freewoman*." Dr. Wordsworth: "*τοῖς ἀρχαίοις—to those of old* (Chrys., Theoph., Maldon., Beng.), at the beginning of God's written revelation, contradistinguished from *ὑμῖν*, '*to* whom *I now speak* face to face.' Our Lord not only opposes the Pharisaic corruptions of the decalogue, but He unfolds it. He gives the kernel of it, its spirit, in opposition to those who dwelt *only* on the letter; for the letter (*i. e.*, taken *alone*) killeth, but the spirit (*added* to it) giveth life, Rom. vii. 14; 2 Cor. iii. 6."—P. S.]

† [Grotius, *ad loc.*, makes the appropriate remark: "Merito *εἰκῆ* additum. Neque eum iracundus est quisquis irasci solet, sed qui *οἷς οὐ δεῖ, καὶ ἐφ' οἷς οὐ δεῖ, καὶ μᾶλλον ἢ δεῖ*, at Aristoteles loquitur."—P. S.]

as an interjection to designate *heretics*, at whom it was customary to spit. In support of this interpretation it might be argued, that the party so reproached was thereby, as it were, arraigned before the Sanhedrim.—The word **fool,** *μωρός*, נָבָל, indicates the hopeless, helpless fool or atheist (Ps. xiv.).—**Shall be in danger of hell fire,** *ἔνοχος ἔσται εἰς τὴν γέενναν*. Here the dative is awanting, as mention is no longer made of any tribunal, but of the punishment at once awarded to such a person. The New Testament term *γέεννα*, or *hell*, must be carefully distinguished from the Jewish *Sheol* or *Hades*, which means merely the realm of the dead or the region of the departed.* Originally, גֵּיא הִנֹּם, the Valley of Hinnom; more precisely, the Valley of the Sons of Hinnom, at the southern declivity of Jerusalem. Afterward, the place where, during the apostasy, the service of Moloch was celebrated, 1 Kings xi. 7. King Josiah converted it into a place of abomination, where dead bodies were thrown and burnt (2 Kings xxiii. 13, 14). Hence it served as a symbol of condemnation, and of the abode of lost spirits (comp. Lightfoot, Eisenmenger, *Entdecktes Judenthum*, and others).

Accordingly, the following are, in *symbolic* language, the three gradations of punishment:—

(1) The sin of anger without a cause—in danger of the local court.

(2) The sin of imputing heresy—in danger of the Sanhedrim, or the highest spiritual judicatory.

(3) The sin of condemning one's neighbor—in danger of immediate condemnation.

These awards of the Lord are evidently not harsh judgments, but in strict accordance with what is absolutely right. He who pronounces judgment without cause, is justly liable to the same judgment he had pronounced, in contravention of the law of love and of truth. The expression *ἔνοχος ἔσται* is peculiarly apt, as meaning, he is *liable*, or justly subject. This implies, not that he is lost in these judgments, but that he stands in need of Divine grace. In His explanation of the sixth commandment, the Lord does not allude to actual murder,—according to Meyer—because such a crime could not be supposed among believers, or, as we think, because the Lord intended to trace back every action to the state of mind from which it sprung. In that respect, he who is angry without cause stands on the same level with the murderer, just as lust in the heart is in reality adultery (1 John iii. 15).

Vers. 23 and 24. *Going to the temple.* **Therefore, if thou bring thy gift to the altar.**—If thou art about to bring an offering. In accordance with the above principles, the party who deems himself offended is treated as if he were the offender, or as debtor to his brother. In short, the Lord addresses Himself to offenders generally. The passage teaches, 1. That when approaching the sanctuary, we learn to feel our personal guilt. 2. In such case, it is more urgent to pay our brother the debt of love than to discharge our debt to the temple; since an offering presented by one who is chargeable with wrong could not be acceptable to God, and the moral purification of man is the great object of the worship of God: *see* Matt. ix. 13 (the *πρῶτον* must be connected with *ὕπαγε*).—In the ancient Church, it was customary for members of a family to ask each other's forgiveness before going to the table of the Lord.

Ver. 25. *Going to the judgment-seat.* This may be regarded as supplementary to what preceded. **Agree,** show thyself agreeable, *εὐνοῶν*, ready for reconciliation, **with thine adversary,** or the opponent in thy cause,—applying to the legal accuser, not to the devil (Clement), nor to God (Augustine), nor to the conscience (Euthymius Zig.). It is a mistake to regard this as a mere prudential rule (Theophylact, Paulus); it embodies a principle of moral right in the form of a symbolic ordinance. Accordingly, the whole passage, as that about going to the temple, has a symbolical meaning. The term **prison,** *φυλακή*, does not refer to purgatory (Roman Cath. interpreters), but to the full measure of punitive justice, which may, indeed, extend to Sheol (Olshausen: "transition state").

Ver. 26. **Farthing.**—The word *κοδράντης*, *quadrans*, a quarter of an *as*, implies that the debt is exacted to the last balance.* Meyer suggests that *ἕως*, *till*, indicates a term, which, however, cannot be reached.

Ver. 28. **Whosoever looketh upon a woman.**—The explanation of our Lord here follows immediately upon the mention of the commandment in Ex. xx. 14, to show that the scribes applied the commandment only to actual adultery. But while the matrimonial law of the Old Testament (although not the seventh commandment) accorded certain privileges to man in his relation to woman (such as the permission of polygamy and of divorce), the Lord here attacks and rebukes chiefly the sins of *man*.

To lust after her, *πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτῆς*.—"The word *πρός* manifestly indicates the mental object or aim" (Tholuck, p. 208). The statement, therefore, refers to intentional and conscious, not to unintentional desires.† Even the latter are sinful; but, as Luther expresses it, a sinful thought, without the consent of the mind, is not mortal sin. "Nevertheless it is a sin, but included in the general forgiveness" (Tholuck, p. 210). In its strict grammatical bearing, the statement would imply that the most general, intentional desire of a carnal nature, is contrary to the spirit of marriage.—**In his heart.**—The heart as the centre of life, and the seat of feeling and desire.

Vers. 29 and 30. **And if thy right eye offend thee.**—The word *σκανδαλίζειν* refers to incitement to sin, which leads to the actual commission of it, and not merely to incitement generally. The **eye** and the **hand** are mentioned as the organs of temptation: the former, as the symbol of delight in look-

* [The English C. V., as also Luther's German V., have almost obliterated the distinction between *hell* and *hades* in the popular mind, by translating *γέεννα* and *ᾅδης* alike *hell* (*Hölle*). The term *γέεννα* occurs 12 times in the N. T., viz., Matt. v. 22, 29, 30; x. 28; xviii. 9; xxiii. 15, 33; Mark ix. 43, 45, 47; Luke xii. 5; James iii. 6, and is always correctly rendered *hell*. The term *ᾅδης* (*sheol*, *spirit-world*, *region of the departed*, *underworld*, *Todtenreich*, *Unterwelt*) occurs 11 times in the N. T., viz., Matt. xi. 23; xvi. 18; Luke x. 15; xvi. 23; Acts ii. 27, 31; 1 Cor. xv. 55; Rev. i. 18; vi. 8; xx. 13, 14, and is inaccurately rendered *hell* in all cases except 1 Cor. xv. 55, where the authorized Version translates *grave*. The difference of the two terms has an important bearing on the doctrine of Christ's descent into Hades, and of the *status intermedius* between death and the resurrection.—P. S.]

* [As *κοδράντης* is one of the smallest denominations of coin, the English *farthing* and the German *Heller* are the precise equivalents as to meaning, and therefore good translations.—P. S.]

† [Dr. Alford, *ad loc.*: "The *βλέπων πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθ.* must not be interpreted of the casual evil thought which is checked by holy watchfulness, but the *gazing with a view to feed that desire* (for so *πρὸς τό* with an infinitive must mean)."—P. S.]

ing (sense of beauty); the latter, as the symbol of converse and intercourse (social feeling, converse, friendship). The **right** eye and the **right** hand, *i. e.*, according to the popular view, the *best:* in the present case, symbolically referring to the fairest view and the highest intercourse. The injunction must neither be taken *literally* (Fritzsche), nor as symbolical of self-denial in the right and lawful use (Grotius), but as a figure of absolute and painful renunciation.

It is profitable for thee.—This cutting off and tearing out will be useful to thee. The word ἵνα, which follows, shows that συμφέρει refers to the previous clause.—This painful self-denial, this seeming self-deprivation of life and enjoyment, is real gain. For in that case only one organ of life is lost (*i. e.*, only in one particular aspect) for this world, while in the other the whole life—here indicated by the body—is given over to hell. The word **body** is used for life, on account of the nature of this sin.

Ver. 31. **It has been said, Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement.**—Christ here first takes up the later perversions of the law about divorce, and returns to the ordinances given by Moses, which He then further explains and develops. "According to Deut. xxiv. 1, עֶרְוַת דָּבָר—עֶרְוָה, 'uncleanness,' 'matter of nakedness,' something abominable in a female—is admitted as a ground of divorce (Ewald, *Alterthümer*, p. 234). Rabbi Shammai and his school explained this as referring to adultery, while Hillel and his school applied it to anything displeasing to a husband (comp. Joseph. *Antiq.* iv. 8, 23). Rosenmüller, *Schol.* on Deut. xxiv. 1, sqq. Rabbi Akiba went even further, and permitted divorce in case a man should meet with a more pleasing woman; *see* Wetstein."—Meyer. The difference between the two schools consisted not merely in this, that while Shammai limited divorce to adultery, Hillel allowed it in a great variety of cases; but that Shammai insisted on the necessity of a criminal and legal cause for divorce, while Hillel left it to the inclination of the individual. The terms employed by Moses implied at least the germ of those spiritual views concerning marriage which were the aim of the theocracy. But the teaching of Hillel destroyed that germ, and converted the law of Moses into a cloak for adulterous lust. As the Lord shows in another place, Moses *allowed* a bill of divorce in the case of moral aberrations on the part of a wife, in order to *limit* the number of divorces. The Rabbins reversed the meaning of the law by saying Moses has *commanded*, Matt. xix. 7. The practice of divorce was an ancient and traditional custom, which Moses limited by insisting on a definite motive, and on a regular bill of divorce. Hence, ὃς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ (according to custom), δότω ἀποστάσιον (according to the new arrangement in Israel). Its object was not merely to serve "as evidence that the marriage had been legally dissolved, and that the woman was at liberty to marry another man" (Ewald), but to render divorce more difficult.

Ver. 32. **Save for the cause of fornication,** παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας.—This exceptional case is not mentioned in Mark x. 11, nor in Luke xvi. 18; but occurs again in Matt. xix. 9 (εἰ μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ), and must be supplied in the parallel passages,—the more so, as, according to Lev. xx. 18, adultery was to be punished with death. Calov, Meyer, and others, maintain that the mention of this one ground of divorce excludes every other; while de Wette thinks that this one implies others also. But the question is not so simple as appears at first sight. We must distinguish between the legislation of the theocracy and that of the state which is intermediate between Moses and Christ; and again, between these two and the spiritual law binding upon Christians, and derived from the word of Christ. Moses permitted a bill of divorce, not to weaken, but to protect the marriage relationship. Absolutely to forbid all divorce, would have amounted to a practical sanction of the then customary low views on the subject of marriage, *and to a rejection of the spiritual principles connected with it.* Hence Moses introduced the bill of divorce, which rendered separation difficult, by requiring an adequate cause for it, as in Deut. xxiv. 1. This arrangement was intended as a lever gradually to elevate the views of the people from the former customary laxity to the spiritual ideal ultimately aimed at. It was left to the gradual development of spiritual life in Israel more clearly to determine and to settle the only sufficient motive for divorce, at which Moses had darkly hinted. This Christ did when He exhibited the full ideal of the law, by the words παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας. But the practical difficulty which the State has to encounter in its legislation on this point, is that it cannot anticipate this interpretation of the Lord without raising the legal ordinances higher than the idea of marriage commonly entertained by the people. Still, this interpretation must always be the goal aimed at. Standing at that goal, our Lord does not refer to the *recognition* of an *actual* divorce, but to a positive divorce, when a man repudiates his wife. To make such a divorce, is certainly not allowed except for the sake of fornication. But it is another question, whether, if the divorce is actually accomplished by the other party, we are warranted in regarding and accepting it as accomplished. To this question Paul gives an affirmative reply in 1 Cor. vii. 15. The only difficulty lies in the question, Under what circumstances other than fornication a divorce may be regarded as actually accomplished by the seceding party? In this respect, the explanations which our Lord adds, may be taken as a final directory.

Causeth her to commit adultery—viz., by contracting another marriage. Strictly speaking, the actual adultery consists in, and dates from, the re-marriage of the woman who had been divorced. The following is the state of the case as laid down by the Lord. In the passage under consideration, we are told that *he causeth* her to commit adultery; and in Matt. xix., that he who divorces a woman, and *marrieth another*, himself committeth adultery. In the former case, the husband who divorces his wife is morally the cause of her committing adultery, and in that respect even more culpable than she. Still, the stigma of adultery is only attached to marriage after divorce, or to fornication before divorce. This implies, that where the guilty or the divorcing party has not actually committed the act of adultery (as above defined), the other party is in Christian duty bound to wait in faith and patience. This is the intermediate stage, or separation *a mensa et thoro*, which is the only kind of divorce allowed by the Roman Church: another species of legalism, by which the words of our Saviour are first converted into a literal ordinance, and next, the letter of the commandment—the παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας—itself is annulled. The bad consequences of this arrangement are sufficiently notorious in the degeneracy of the marriage relation in Roman Catholic countries, especially in South America.

"Our Lord," says Meyer, "does not refer to the case of adultery committed by the man,—there being no occasion for it, since a woman, according to the law of Moses, could not divorce her husband. But the spirit of Christian ethics fully justifies and requires the application of the statement to the other case." However, it ought to be noted, that Christ speaks *three* different times of the sin of the *man*, but never of the woman: (1) Whosoever looketh on a woman, etc.; (2) whosoever shall put away his wife, etc.; (3) whosoever shall marry her who is divorced, etc.—Comp. Heubner, p. 68.

Ver. 33. **Thou shalt not forswear thyself,** *οὐκ ἐπιορκήσεις* (*swear falsely*): Ex. xxvii.; Lev. xix. 12.—In this instance, also, the Lord first reverts to the law as given by Moses, showing its full and spiritual import, and then condemns the perversions of it introduced by traditionalism. Like divorce, the practice of taking an oath was an ancient custom, which existed before the time of Moses. Considering it indispensable in civil causes, the legislator adopted it in his code (Ex. xxii. 11, comp. Heb. vi. 16), just as he admitted divorce. But as all license was restrained by the enactment concerning the bill of divorce, so all levity by the ordinances attaching to an oath, viz.: (1) by the condemnation of a false oath, Ex. xx. 7; Lev. xix. 12; (2) by the injunction to regard vows as sacred, and to fulfil them, Num. xxx. 3; (3) by the direction to take an oath only in the name of the Lord, Deut. vi. 13. Hence, when Christ ordains, **Swear not at all,** He enters fully into the spirit of this legislation, and fulfils this law, or carries it to its ideal. The internal agreement between the saying of the Lord and the law of Moses is evident. As, in the case of the law of divorce, Jesus had brought out the latent prohibition of Moses, by presenting it without the temporary and conditional *permission* attaching to it; so here also the same latent prohibition appears when the Saviour carries out the spirit of the limitations introduced by Moses, which ultimately aimed at the complete abrogation of the oath. But the law of Moses was intended to bring out the spiritual nature of marriage, and not as absolute legislation on the subject. Similarly, his ordinances concerning oaths were not intended to abrogate them completely, but to bring out the ultimate idea of an oath—the yea, yea, nay, nay!—both as before God. In these instances, however, Christ aims not merely after a negative, but after a positive result,—in the present case, to introduce the oath in its spiritual aspect. Accordingly, He now shows the difference between it and the practice common among the Jews. This consists not merely in the fact, that what had been sanctioned for judicial procedure was now used in every-day life, but also in the introduction of additional asseverations and of self-imprecations in the common mode of taking oaths, *ὀμόσαι*. These asseverations by heaven, by earth, etc.—this pledging as it were of things over which we have no control—are manifestly sinful. In a certain sense, they convert an oath into a curse. Hence, rendering the words of Christ according to their import, we might almost translate them: But I say unto you, *Curse* not, not at all! Since the oath, in the proper sense of the term, had thus degenerated, and been almost completely perverted, it was to cease, but only in order to give place to what was implied in the true idea of the oath—the calm and solemn attestation: yea, yea; nay, nay; as in the presence of God. The relation in which the Christian State and the Christian citizen stand to this absolute spiritual law, is the same as we formerly noticed in reference to marriage. So far as our own personal conduct is concerned, we are to adopt in the fullest sense the New Testament direction (James v. 12); it is the duty of the State to aim after realizing the ideal here set before it, while the Christian citizen is bound humbly to submit. (In this, and in similar respects, it is important to distinguish between the duty of bearing testimony and that of obedience. There is no inconsistency, for example, in the Christian minister, who as an evangelist is opposed to all war, and yet acts as an humble and efficient military chaplain.) This explanation Christ has sanctioned by His example. Like the patriarchs of old (Gen. xxi. 23, 24; xxxi. 34; xlvii. 31), He acknowledged the lawfulness of the adjuration before the Sanhedrim (Matt. xxvi. 64). It is not an isolated error when certain sectarians—as the Anabaptists of the Reformation period, the Mennonites, and the Quakers—confound the duty of the individual Christian as such with that of the citizen; the mistake goes far deeper. They deny in principle the moral and educational character and object of the State, which is intended to be subservient to the kingdom of heaven and to promote it. From the example of Paul (Rom. ix. 1; 2 Cor. xi. 10) we gather how the spiritual nature of the oath appears, when the Christian appeals to his fellowship with God in support of the reality and certainty of his assertions. Viewed in this light, the oath of the Christian is based even on that of the Lord Himself (Isa. xlv. 23; Heb. vi. 13). God swears by Himself, *i. e.*, He appeals to His absolute and personal certitude; and the Christian swears before God, when he solemnly attests his statement under a calm sense of the presence of, and of communion with, God. It is the duty of the State more and more to modify the oath in conformity to the spirit of the gospel, and to acknowledge a simple Christian assurance as equivalent to an oath. The Church cannot require an oath without obscuring the consciousness of standing before the Lord with all the solemn affirmations and vows of her members. Comp. on the different explanations Heubner, *Com.* p. 71 [and Tholuck, *Bergpredigt*, p. 258–275].

The scribes insisted on the obligatory character of vows, but distinguished between oaths which were binding and others which were not binding. Maimonides: *Si quis jurat per cœlum, per terram, per solem, non est juramentum.* Comp. Matt. xxiii. 16 Similarly, Philo regarded oaths by heaven, by earth, etc., as not very important, and advised that they should be employed rather than a direct appeal to the Most High God.

Ver. 34. **Swear not at all.**—For the different interpretations of this prohibition, comp. Tholuck.—To swear not at all, if it be incompatible with due reverence toward God (Tholuck).—Not to swear lightly in ordinary life (Berlepsch),—not to swear after the manner and in the sense of the Jews (Matthiä).—Strict prohibition which is binding, so far as the kingdom of heaven is concerned, but not applying to our duty as citizens in the State (de Wette, Meyer).—Absolute prohibition binding at all times, and under all circumstances (the Quakers) Comp. also Winer, Heubner, Göschel (*Der Eid*), etc.*

* [We add the explanations of the latest English and American commentators on Matthew. Dr. ALFORD (Episcopalian), 4th Engl. ed. *ad loc.*: "In the words, *Swear not at all*, our Lord does not so much make a positive enactment by which all swearing is to individuals forbidden, *e. g.*

Vers. 34–36. **Neither by heaven,** etc.—"These modes of swearing were customary at the time among the Jews. Comp. Philo, *De spec. leg.* 776; Lightfoot; Meuschen, *Novum Testam. ex Talm. illustr.* p. 58."—Meyer. [Dr. Thomson in his excellent work, *The Land and the Book*, vol. i., p. 284, says of the modern Orientals that they "are fearfully profane. Everybody curses and swears when in a passion. No people that I have ever known can compare with these Orientals for profaneness in the use of the names and attributes of God. . . . They swear by the *head*, by their *life*, by *heaven*, and by the *temple*, or, what is in its place, the *church*. The forms of cursing and swearing, however, are almost infinite, and fall on the pained ear all day long."—P. S.]

Ver. 37. **But let your communication be, Yea, yea, Nay, nay.**—Similar expressions in the Rabbins, הֵן הֵן and לֹא לֹא. Beza: Let your affirmative communication be yea, your negative, nay. Grotius: Let your affirmation and negation be in accordance with fact. Meyer: The repetition in the formula indicates emphasis in the assurance. James v. 12: Let your yea be yea, and your nay be nay. Luther: A yea that is yea. (The same as Grotius.) Undoubtedly, the intention is to combine decidedness of assurance with the certitude of the fact. But the positive import of the "yea, yea," is overlooked by those who imagine that the Lord concludes with a mere negative result. The true oath consists in the simple asseveration, uttered in perfect consciousness and under a sense of the presence of God, before Him, and in Him.

Cometh of evil, ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ.—1. Euthym. Zig., ἐκ τοῦ διαβόλου. Similarly Chrysostom, Theophylact, Beza, Zwingle, Fritzsche, Meyer, and others. 2. From the πονηρόν, of evil, as a neuter.—The two in so far agree, as Christ uniformly traces all πονηρόν, or evil in the world, to the πονηρός. The statement, however, is not to be interpreted as meaning, that the traditional mode of swearing is of the devil, but as implying that the kingdom of darkness has occasioned this kind of asseverations; and that actual evil also attaches to them, in as far as they indicate a want of reverence, a pledging of things which belong to God, and a kind of imprecation.

Ver. 38. **An eye for an eye,** Ex. xxi. 24.—The right of retribution, *jus talionis*. A general principle of law, presented here in the form of a proverb, and applied to a special case. This principle was undoubtedly introduced into the judicature, not to foster revenge (as de Wette imagines), but to substitute law for private vengeance (Lev. xix. 18). We agree with Tholuck, that the Pharisees, in this instance, converted a principle of judicature into a rule of everyday life. But Meyer is likewise right in adding, that a Christian should not exact even judicial vengeance from his neighbor, as also appears from the word κριθῆναι, which follows.

Vers. 39–42. **But I say unto you, Resist not** τῷ πονηρῷ.—Chrysostom and Theophylact refer this to the *devil;* Augustin and Calvin, to *wrong;* Tholuck, to *evil;* de Wette and Meyer, to an *evil person*. The words ὅστις σε ῥαπίσει are apparently in favor of the latter interpretation. But, on the other hand, the idea of evil men scarcely applies to the various cases afterward enumerated. We are not to resist—as we understand it—the evil that is in the world (the combination of sin and evil):—

(1) As we encounter it in violent offenders;
(2) As we encounter it in litigious accusers;
(3) As we encounter it in intrusive applicants for favors, or else slavish instruments of superior powers;
(4) As we encounter it in beggars and borrowers.

Beggars and borrowers can scarcely be ranked among evil men. Hence our Lord must refer to the sin and evil in the world which is conquered by wise and Christian submission, rather than by strenuous resistance. In all the instances just mentioned, we do not yield from weakness to the course of events, but voluntarily desist from our just claims in the exercise of self-denying love. This yielding, in reality, constitutes true heroism, by which alone injustice can be conquered. To be merely passive or non-resistant were weakness; but a passiveness which springs from Christian principle, and has a spiritual object in view, is true strength and real victory. To present the left cheek to him who smites us on the right, is to return the blow in the right sense; to give the cloak, is to have gained the suit about the coat; to go two miles instead of the one that is imposed on us, is to overcome the arbitrary power that would coerce us; to meet the wants of others, is to render begging impossible; and not to turn away from him who would borrow, is to train him to right independence.

Of course, these expressions, in their paradox form, must not be taken literally. The fundamental idea of the passage is, that Christian love must make us willing to bear twice as much as the world, in its

on solemn occasions, and for the satisfaction of others (for that would be a mere technical Pharisaism wholly at variance with the spirit of the Gospel, and inconsistent with the example of *God Himself*, Heb. vi. 13–17; vii. 21; *of the Lord when on earth*, whose ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν was a solemn asseveration, and who at once respected the solemn adjuration of Caiaphas, ch. xxvi. 63, 64; *of His Apostles*, writing under the guidance of His Spirit, *see* Gal. i. 20; 2 Cor. i. 23; Rom. i. 9; Phil. i. 8, and especially 1 Cor. xv. 31; *of His holy angels*, Rev. x. 6), as declare to us, that the *proper state* of Christians is, to *require no oaths;* that when τὸ πονηρόν is expelled from among them, every ναί and οὐ will be as decisive as an oath, every promise as binding as a vow. We observe (*a*) that these verses imply the unfitness of *vows* of every kind as rules of Christian action; (*b*) that the greatest regard ought to be had to the scruples of those, not only sects, but individuals, who object to taking an oath, and every facility given in a Christian state for their (?) ultimate entire abolition."—(Does *their* refer to scruples, or is it a mistake for *its*, *i. e.* the oath's?)—Dr. Wordsworth (Episcopalian) gives a similar interpretation, though not so fully, and quotes from St. Augustine: *Non ames, non affectes, non appetas jusjurandum*, which is hardly sufficient. He also remarks that the corresponding Hebrew verb שָׁבַע (from שֶׁבַע, seven, the holy number of the covenant) is used only in *Niphal* (*i. e.*, *to be made to swear*, or rather *to seven oneself*, *i. e.*, to take an oath confirmed by seven victims offered as sacrifice to God, Gen. xxi. 28 sq., or before seven witnesses), and in *Hiphil* (*i. e.*, *to cause to swear*, *to bind by an oath*); as much as to intimate that no one ought to swear except when compelled to do so.—Alb. Barnes (N. S. Presbyterian): "*Swear not at all.* That is, in the manner which He proceeds to specify. Swear not in any of the common and profane ways customary at that time."—Dr. Jos. Addis. Alexander (O. S. Presbyterian): "Christ teaches that the sin, where there is any, consists not in swearing falsely, which is a distinct offence punished both by God and man, nor in any particular form of oath, but in swearing at all without necessity or warrant."—Dr. D. D. Whedon (Methodist) *ad loc.:* "Neither in his prohibition of swearing nor of violence (33–42) is our Lord giving any law for the magistrate or the governmental regulations, but for private conduct. The officer of government has still a right to use force, and the magistrate to administer an oath. In fact, to forbid these things in private life secures that they may be done magistratively with better effect. None of the oaths which our Lord adduces as specimens are judicial oaths, but the ordinary profanities of the Orientalists."—P. S.]

injustice, could demand. But in this case also, the requirements of the moral law must guide us in applying the principle here laid down to every particular instance (comp. the example of the Lord, John xviii. 22).

Ver. 40. Κριθῆναι, *litigare, to sue at law.*—Χιτών (*coat*), the *under garment*.—Ἱμάτιον, the more expensive *upper garment* or *cloak*, which was also used for a covering at night, and hence could not be retained as a pledge over night (comp. Luke vi. 29).

Ver. 41. **Compel.**—Ἀγγαρεύειν, a word introduced from the Persian into the Greek and into rabbinical language; meaning, to compel for the purposes of transport, or for conveying messengers, in accordance with the postal arrangements of Cyrus, who authorized messengers to compel others to convey them: Herod. viii. 98.* This compulsion is mentioned third, because those who did it were officially obliged to resort to such measures. Besides, the word is here used in a more general sense, referring to a traveller who exacts under the stress of necessity. From the above we conclude, that those mentioned in the fourth example do not belong to a different category, as Ewald suggests.

Ver. 43. **Thy neighbor,** πλησίον, לְרֵעֲךָ Lev. xix. 18.—This passage referred in the first instance, as the context shows, to Jews, although ver. 34 proves that it includes love to our neighbors generally. The Pharisees argued, that the injunction to love our neighbor implied that it referred only to such, and that all Gentiles were to be hated. They went even further, and regarding those only as Jews who adhered to traditionalism, stigmatized as strangers not merely Gentiles, but publicans, and every one who shared not their peculiar views. But their great argument was, that every one who was not a Jew was an enemy, and that every enemy should be hated. Hence their pride and contempt of men, the *odium generis humani*. Meyer adds, that "the casuistic tradition of the Pharisees explained the word 'neighbor' as meaning friend, and inferring from it—perhaps in connection with Deut. xxv. 17–19 (comp. Mal. i. 3)—that every enemy should be hated,—a principle, as is well known, shared also by the Greeks." But we see no reason for identifying the system of the Pharisees with the popular prejudices of the Gentiles. According to Grotius, the inference—to hate our enemies—was derived by the Pharisees from the command of God to destroy the Canaanites, etc.,—a statement which scarcely deserves the serious refutation of Heubner and Gerlach. The latter was manifestly a special theocratic injunction, bearing reference to the *heathen institutions of the Canaanites*, and not to the people as individuals (as appears from the history of Rahab).

Ver. 44. **Love your enemies,**—is the principle from which all the following directions flow. The expression must be taken in all its literality, and the injunction is universally applicable.—By his very hatred, our enemy becomes our neighbor, since his hatred tempts us to retaliate, and leaves us no choice but to fall, or else to defend ourselves by the weapons of love. In the latter case, *cursing* is met with *blessing; hatred*, which leads to injuries, by *well-doing; threatening*, or *calumniating* in secret (ἐπηρεάζειν, from ἐπήρεια, threat, contumely), and *persecution*, by *prayer* and *intercession* on our part. Comp. Cyprian, *De mortalitate*, and Heubner, p. 76.

Ver. 45. **That ye may be.**—The expression refers not merely "to final salvation in the kingdom of heaven," but means, that ye may prove yourselves really the children of God, His sons, in the peculiar sense explained in ch. v. 9. For this constitutes the evidence of being "peacemakers," whose great model is Christ Himself.—The Lord appeals to the example of His Father, in order to show the nature and universality of highest love; while the publicans and the heathen exemplify the egotism and narrow-mindedness of a selfish community,—a sin of which the Pharisees also were guilty, and which they sought to invest with the halo of special sanctity.

Ver. 46. **The publicans,** τελῶναι, partly natives and partly Romans, employed in the service of the Roman knights who had leased the taxes of the country. They were disliked as being the representatives of Roman domination, and for their rigor and exactions. The Pharisees no doubt regarded them as under the ban, and in the same category as Gentiles (comp. Matt. xviii. 17).

Ver. 47. **And if ye salute.**—The persons saluted are here designated as **brethren,** meaning co-religionists. Hence the salutation indicates friendliness and readiness to serve.*

Ver. 48. **Be ye therefore perfect,**—in the moral sense, perfectness being your ultimate aim.†

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The Lord purposely makes no reference to pure Antinomianism, because such opposition to the law exposed or condemned itself. But He rends the veil of pretended adherence to the law under which traditionalism sought to hide its real Antinomianism, and shows how in all its essential features it is destructive of the law—a hostility which at last manifested itself in all its fulness in the crucifixion of Christ. This tendency springs from a rigid and carnal adherence to the letter, which takes away the symbolical import of the letter, and at the same time converts the law into a series of secular and external traditions. Traditionalism first converts the law itself into traditions, and then adds its own special traditions by way of explanation. It assumes various forms: externalism, which results from the spiritual deadness of legalism; perversion or detraction from the true import of the law, as prompted by the dictates of lust or passion; and, finally, apparent increase of rigidness resulting from egotism, fanaticism, and spiritual pride. Thus, what was meant to serve as the eternal foundation of humanity became chang-

* [Also Xenophon, Cyrop. viii. 6, 17. Comp. the classical dictionaries sub verbo *Angaria*, and Tholuck, Meyer, Conant, and Alford *ad loc.* The corresponding English word for ἀγγαρεύειν in its proper technical sense is *to impress*, *i. e.*, to press or force into public service by public authority. The word occurs three times in the N. T., here, Matt. xxvii. 32, and Mark xv. 21, where it is used of Simon who was impressed to bear the cross of our Saviour to Calvary. The Jews were strongly opposed to the duty of furnishing posts for the hated Roman government. The ἐπισταθμία, or billeting of the Roman soldiers and their horses on the Jews, was one kind of this ἀγγαρία.—P. S.]

* [Ἀσπάσησθε may as well be taken, with Alford and others, in its literal sense. Jews did not salute Gentiles, as Mohammedans even now in the East do not salute Christians.—P. S.]

† [Comp. Alford, Wordsworth, Whedon, and other English commentators on this passage and its bearing on the doctrine of perfectibility or the attainability of moral perfection in this life, which Alford opposes as inconsistent with the whole discourse, especially vers. 22, 29, 32, as well as with Phil. iii. 12; while Wordsworth and Whedon favor it, the former in the patristic sense, quoting from St. Jerome, the latter in the sense of modern Methodism.—P. S.]

ed into hatred of mankind.—What is here said of Old Testament traditionalism equally applies to that of the mediæval Church, in its relation to the Gospel.

2. Some have difficulty in regarding Christianity as the genuine development of the teaching of Moses and of the prophets. This partly arises from the circumstance that, notwithstanding the express statements of the Lord, many imagine that Christ abolished the law of Moses in its substance. The statements of Paul about the abolition of the law, so far as its temporary form was concerned (Eph. ii. 15; Col. ii. 14), are similarly misinterpreted, while his declaration in Rom. iii. 31 is entirely overlooked. It is only when we learn to trace throughout all history a double course of tradition—one internal and ideal, the other external and ever lapsing into secularism—that we fully understand the difference and the agreement between the Old and the New Dispensation. Hegel, too, only knew of the external tradition, and assumes that Socrates and Christ died according to law.

3. The positive idea underlying this section is, that in the doctrine of Christ the teaching of Moses was fulfilled and carried to its spiritual ideal. Murder, adultery, profane swearing, revenge, and the rancor and selfishness of party spirit, are destroyed, not merely in their outward manifestations, but in their root. In their stead, Jesus sets before us a holy, spiritual gentleness, a holy and spiritual marriage, a holy and spiritual oath, a holy and spiritual retribution, and a holy and spiritual love toward our neighbor. These, however, are only instances by which the whole law must be explained. Five are mentioned as being the symbolical number of liberty and moral development, whether for good or evil.

4. Christ is the end and the fulfilment of the law (Rom. x. 4; xiii. 10). Here, then, we have another picture of the life of Jesus. The Sermon on the Mount presents to our view the righteousness of Jesus in itself; here, we have it in its contrast with that of the Pharisees and scribes. Himself, however, in holy meekness, stands in the background, and only presents to His disciples this picture, as constituting their heavenly calling.

5. It is strangely and sadly characteristic of the Church of Rome, that it should have converted these fulfilments of the law of Moses into so-called "*consilia evangelica*," and thus declared them, (1) not universally binding; (2) a directory for a species of higher legal righteousness,—such, for example, as that of the monks. Similar instances of strange—we had almost said, fatal—misinterpretation by the same Church, occur in connection with the two swords, Luke xxii. 38, the Lord's Prayer, the laws on matrimony, etc.

[6. Ver. 48. *Be ye perfect*, etc. "We who are created in God's image, and restored in Christ, and made partakers of the divine nature in Him, are bound by the conditions of our creation, redemption, and sanctification, to endeavor to be like Him here, that we may have the fruition of His glorious Godhead hereafter. Eph. iv. 1; 1 Pet. i. 15; 1 John ii. 1."]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The righteousness of the kingdom of heaven, and that of the Pharisees and scribes: 1. The former spiritual, from the Spirit of God; the latter worldly, and from the spirit of the world. 2. The former implying a state of mind; the latter, outward and merely apparent service. 3. The former continuing throughout eternity; the latter passing away with the world.—A living and true faith, and dead orthodoxy.—Antagonism between the spirit of the law and the mere letter of the law.—True and false tradition.—The ordinances of man an abolition of the commandments of God.—While pretending to make a "hedge" around the law (which itself was a hedge), the Pharisees trod down the plants in the garden of the Lord.—The perversions of truth which appear under the guise of enforcing truth.—On the difference between "*It is written*," and "*It has been said*."—"*It has been said*," as pointing to the impure source of tradition. 1. It has been said; but we know not by whom, where, or when; 2. It has been said, by religious indolence, by carnality and deadness.—"*It has been said*," or the origin of tradition within the kingdom of God.—Our proper respect for what is ancient appears in proper reverence for what is eternal, which is at the same time both old and new.—The hearts of the fathers must be turned to the children, then shall the hearts of the children also be turned to the fathers (Mal. iii. 7; Luke i. 17).—The word of the Lord: "*But I say unto you*."—If the letter of the law were carried out to its full length, it would consume the world, as did the fire of Elijah.—Christ condemning the service of the letter by the spirit of the letter.—Contrast between "*It has been said to them of old*," and "*But I say unto you*." 1. In the one case, it is the general unspiritual mass that speaks; here, it is the highest Personage—the Lord Himself. 2. In the former case, it has been said to past generations; in this, the Lord speaks to those around Him. 3. The former is a tradition from the grave; the latter, a word of life to the living.—The explanation given by the Lord of the commandment, *Thou shalt not kill*. 1. His correction of traditionalism; 2. the law of the spirit.—(The same remarks apply to our Lord's explanation of the other commandments.)—The anger of passion, the way to judgment and to hell.—The passion of anger appearing in reproaches.—He that judgeth set right in judgment: 1. Sudden passion set right by the dignity of the secular judgment-seat. 2. He who charges others with heresy set right by the judgment of the Church. 3. He who condemns set right by history, or the prospect of condemnation.—*Going to the temple*, an admonition to reconciliation.—*Going to the judge*, an exhortation to render satisfaction.—The sanctity of marriage, as opposed both to concupiscence and to divorce.—The sacred oath under the New Covenant is Yea, yea; Nay, nay.—The law of retribution: 1. Private vengeance giving place to law; 2. vengeance left to the proper authorities; 3. vengeance left to the Lord.—Our enemy becomes our neighbor by his aggressions upon us, which leave us no choice but either to *hate* or to *love*.—Love toward our enemies the weapon of spiritual defence against them.—Sunshine and rain preaching toleration and love.—The Divine rule equally over the good and the evil.—Sacred meditations during sunshine.—Sacred meditations during the rain.—Party spirit only a different form of egotism.—Party spirit under the guise of sanctity: 1. So far as our own nation is concerned; 2. so far as our religion is concerned; 3. so far as our own ecclesiastical denomination is concerned.—Love the bond of perfectness in spiritual life.—To feel that malice is weakness leads to pity.—The children of the Father in heaven: 1. Like their Father, they care for the world; 2. they bring it sunshine

and rain; 3. in their Father they are hid from the world.

Starke:—Pharisaical legalists cannot but explain the law falsely.—The law is spiritual.—The Gospel has regard to the spirit, not to the letter, 2 Cor. iii. 6.—As one sin is more grievous than another (John xix. 11), so the temporal and eternal punishments of God also (vers. 11, 22, 24).—A genuine Christian will abstain from all opprobrious epithets.—All your worship is vain, so long as your heart retains enmity. Reconciliation is more necessary than anything else. —God has made our forgiveness the condition of His, Job xlii. 8; 1 Pet. iii. 7.—He who neither forgives nor asks forgiveness, nor makes restitution, renders himself unworthy of the Lord's table.—Let us not lose the season of grace.—True repentance is painful, but salutary.—If thine eye offend thee, etc.; *see* Coll. iii. 5.—Men like to interpret the Scriptures according to their corrupt inclinations.—We must enter into the married estate in the fear of God, if our union is to prove happy.—If we suffer violence and bear it patiently, we shall be able to derive advantage even from the injustice of men.—To give and to lend are both fruits of love, Ps. cxii. 5.—Even to love our enemies is regarded as too difficult; but who among us thinks of blessing them and of praying for them?—Oh where shall we find Christians among these Christians? Hos. iv. 1.—By faith we become the children of God, Rom. viii. 14; Gal. iii. 26. But love proves that we resemble our Father (1 John iii. 10), who is love, 1 John iv. 8.—If God had not loved us when we were still His enemies, we should never have become His children, Rom. v. 8, 9; and now we should cease to be the children of God if we ceased to follow Him in love, Eph. v. 12.—God would disarm our enemies by His long-suffering and by our kindness.—Love toward our enemies is both an evidence of sonship and a means of strengthening it, 2 Pet. i. 10.—Let us set more by the example of God than by that of the world, with its hatred and callousness, Luke vi. 36.—God rewards only such virtue of which Himself is the beginning and the end.—God is willing to help all men, and His own people share the same mind, Rom. x. 1.—Many are ready to imitate God in His punitive justice, but few in His love.

Lisco:—(The pericope v. 20–26.) Those who have part in the kingdom of heaven cannot rest satisfied with the righteousness which Judaism regarded as sufficient, and which consisted in mere *legalism* and *outward morality*, without regard to the mind and heart.—True love is the sacrifice of all sacrifices. —Sinful lust must die in our hearts, and purity spring up, ch. xviii. 8; Mark ix. 43.—Every oath is a solemn asseveration of truth, in which God is invoked as witness of the truth and avenger of untruth. Hence it always bears reference to God; and, whether it be in the form of witness-bearing or solemn promise, it is always an act of worship.—True love must bear and submit, and thus prevail. But this does not imply that we are not allowed to seek assistance or protection from magistrates or judges, who are instituted by God for that very purpose (Rom. xiii. 4).—There is in these commandments of Christ a progression from what is easier to what is more difficult.—To love our enemies was commanded even in the Old Testament, Ex. xxiii. 4, 5; Prov. xxv. 21. Hence it was a lying addition to the command of God, to say, *Thou shalt hate thine enemy*.—Christ says, *Your* Father and *My* Father, but never, *Our* Father; the distinction is always marked, John i. 12. —Perfect love is perfect bliss.

Gerlach:—The Old Testament itself contained the germ which was destined to burst through all husks.—Luther: Thinkest thou that God refers only to thy fist when He says, "Thou shalt not kill"? Whosoever does not love is a murderer, 1 John iii. 15.—Every one of us is on his way to the Judge, without knowing how long the road may be.—The heart belongs to God, it is the temple of the Holy Ghost. Who would not be afraid to commit adultery in a temple made of stone? and shall we not be afraid to do it in our hearts? *—Chrysostom: Have you noticed how many steps He has gone up, and how He has now placed us on the very summit of virtue? Look back! The first step upward was to do no wrong to our neighbor; the second, not to reward evil for evil, if he had done us wrong; the third, not to revile him, but to remain silent; the fourth, to offer our persons in order to take wrong; the fifth, to offer more than the offender demands; the sixth, not to hate him who had done us wrong; the seventh, even to love him; the eighth, to do him good; the ninth, to entreat God for him. Do you now perceive the full height of Christian virtue?—Every further explanation of His requirements on the part of God is based on a fresh manifestation of His holy character and love.

Heubner:—If you are angry with a child of your Father, how can you venture to approach the Father? Pericope for the 6th Sunday after Trinity: False and true righteousness: 1. their character; 2. their manifestations; 3. their effects.—Spener's sermon on this text preached at Frankfort, A. D. 1669.—"Thou hast cleft my heart in twain. Oh! throw away the worser part of it, and live the purer with the other half:" Shakspeare (Hamlet, iii. 4).—Not to resist, does not mean to submit patiently and passively to all aggressions, but not to meet evil by evil.—*Harms*: The close connection between love to our neighbor and true religion. [1. Love to our neighbor is one of the grounds of true religion, and leads to it. 2. Love to our neighbor is part of true religion, and belongs to it. 3. Love to our neighbor is a consequence of true religion.]†—*Marheineke*: What that righteousness is which excels the righteousness of the Pharisees and scribes: 1. Love to the commandment, yet not disjoined from love to God; 2. love to God, yet not disjoined from love to man; 3. love to man, yet not disjoined from love to our neighbor.—*Schleiermacher* (Sermons, vol. iv.): What the Lord would have us to learn from these words, especially with reference to united worship and service.—*Kniewel*: The righteousness of the Pharisees (its character; how to avoid it).

* [This sentence should be credited to Starke, from whom Otto von Gerlach (*ad Matt* v. 28) almost literally borrowed it. Starke remarks to Matt. v. 28 (N. T., vol. i., p. 187): "*Man scheuet sich vor den Augen der Menschen in einer steinernen Kirche einen äusserlichen Ehebruch zu begehen; und scheuet sich nicht vor Gottes Augen viel Ehebrüche im Tempel seines Herzens zu begehen.*"—P. S.]

† [Omitted in the third edition, but retained here from the transl. of the first.—P. S.]

2. *Christianity and Pharisaism in their relation to the great virtues of the law; or, three examples from life, showing the perversions of the Pharisees and Scribes, and the spiritual elevation of true Christianity.*

CHAPTER VI. 1–18.

False Spirituality of Traditionalism.

1 Take heed that ye do not your alms [righteousness][1] before men, to be seen of [by]
them: otherwise ye have no reward of your Father which [who] is in heaven.
2 Therefore, when thou doest *thine* alms, do not sound a trumpet before thee, as the
hypocrites do in the synagogues and in the streets, that they may have glory of men.
3 Verily I say unto you, They have [all][2] their reward. But when thou doest alms, let
4 not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth: That thine alms may be in secret:
and thy Father which seeth in secret Himself shall reward thee openly.[3]
5 And when thou prayest,[4] thou shalt not be as the hypocrites *are:* for they love to
pray standing in the synagogues and in the corners of the streets, that they may be
6 seen of [by] men. Verily I say unto you, They have [all] their reward. But thou,
when thou prayest, enter into thy closet; and, when thou hast shut thy door, pray to
thy Father which [who] is in secret; and thy Father which [who] seeth in secret shall
7 reward thee openly.[5] But when ye pray, use not vain repetitions, as the heathen *do:*
8 for they think that they shall be heard for their much speaking. Be not ye therefore
like unto them: for your Father knoweth what things ye have need of, before ye ask
9 him. After this manner therefore pray ye:
10 Our Father which [who] art in heaven, Hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom
come. Thy will be done in earth, as *it is* in heaven [lit.: as in heaven, so also on
12 earth]. Give us this day our daily[6] bread. And forgive us our debts, as we forgive[7]
13 our debtors. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil: For thine is
14 the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen.[8] For if ye forgive men
15 their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you: But if ye forgive not men
their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses.
16 Moreover when ye fast, be not, as the hypocrites, of a sad countenance: for they
disfigure their faces, that they may appear unto men to fast. Verily I say unto you,
17 They have [all] their reward. But thou, when thou fastest, anoint thine head, and wash
18 thy face; That thou appear not unto men to fast, but unto thy Father which [who] is in
secret: and thy Father which [who] seeth in secret shall reward thee openly.[9]

[1] Ver. 1.—[*Textus rec.:* ἐλεημοσύνην. But Dr. Lange translates: *Eure Gerechtigkeit, your righteousness*, adopting δικαιοσύνην as the correct reading, which is much better authenticated, and preferred by the principal editors of the Greek text. *See* the critical apparatus in Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Alford, and Tregelles, also Green: *Developed Criticism*, p. 8.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 2.—[The full force of ἀπέχουσι is not given in the E. V., but in the German: *sie haben dahin*, *i. e.*, they have their reward *in full*, they have received *all* of it, and need not expect any more. *See* the Greek dict. *sub* ἀπέχω.—P. S.]

[3] Ver. 4.—ἐν τῷ φανερῷ (*openly*) are omitted in Cod. B. D. Z., etc. [and in Lange's version].

[4] Ver. 5.—*Text. rec.:* ὅταν προσεύχῃ. [But the plural προσεύχησθε, *ye pray*, and οὐκ ἔσεσθε, *ye shall not be*, is well sustained and adopted by Dr. Lange.—P. S.]

[5] Ver. 6.—*Openly* is better sustained here (E. K. L., etc.) than in ver. 4.

[6] Ver. 11.—[“*Daily* bread,” or “*tägliches* Brot,” is a free but substantially correct and generally intelligible translation of ἄρτος ἐπιούσιος, and very properly retained by Dr. Lange from Luther's version, with which here the Author. English and all other English versions (Tyndale, Cranmer, and Geneva) correspond, except Wiclif, who renders: *breed ouir other substaunce*, and the Romish V. of Rheims and Douay, which follows the Vulgate and renders: *supersubstantial* bread. *Daily* is also found in the *Itala* of the second century (panem nostrum *quotidianum*) in the *Vulgata* in Luke xi. 8 (but not in Matt. vi. 11, where the Vulgate reads *supersubstantialem*), and in most of the modern European versions, the French (pain *quotidien*), the Dutch (*dagelicks* Broot), the Italian of Diodati (pane *cotidiano*). The only other translation which is admissible and gives good sense, is that of the Peschito: “our *needful* bread” (comp. Murdock's transl. of the Peschito, New York, 1852), or bread *suited to our nature*, or as others modify it: bread *necessary for our subsistence, sufficient.* This is the explanation of Origen, Chrysost., Theophyl., Beza, Tholuck, Ewald, Arnoldi, and amounts in meaning to the same as the more popular translation “*daily* bread.” The precarious etymology and explanation now in vogue and adopted by such eminent biblical philologists as Winer in his Grammar of the N. T., and Fritzsche and Meyer in their Com. on Matthew, derives ἐπιούσιος from ἐπιέναι, after the form of the fem. part. ἐπιοῦσα sc. ἡμέρα (dies crastinus), and would thus make us pray *to-day* for the bread which we may need *to-morrow*. But this, as Lange (in the Com.), Alford and others observe, is evidently inconsistent with the Saviour's warning in ver. 34, and as Conant remarks in a judicious note *ad loc.*, would make us pray for an absurdity, since we have no need to-day of to-morrow's bread: “Taking the word *bread* in the *literal* sense (as sustenance for the body), the only thing we can ask, without a manifest absurdity, is bread *sufficient for the day*, or *daily bread*.” Salmasius made the same objection, and asked:

"Quid est ineptius, quam panem crastini diei nobis quotidie postulare?" Schöttgen quotes passages from the Rabbis, which show that even among the most pious of the Jews it was not customary to pray for the things of the morrow. As *ἐπιούσιος* is found only here and in the parallel passage, Luke xi. 3, but in no other Greek writings, its meaning cannot be ascertained from usage, nor from etymology alone. Meyer, however, admits that *ἐπιούσιος may* be derived from the noun *οὐσία* (or from the fem. participle of *εἶναι*, as *παρουσία, μετουσία*). The objection that then it would be *ἐπούσιος* instead of *ἐπιούσιος*, is not decisive, since we have *ἐπόπτος* (visible), and the poetic form *ἐπίοπτος*; comp. also *ἐπίορκος* (from *ὅρκος*), *ἐπίουρος* (from *οὖρος*), *ἐπιόγδοος*, seven and a half, *sesquioctavus* (from *ὄγδοος*). Nor does *οὐσία* only mean existence and essence, but also substance, property, subsistence; comp. Luke xv. 12: *τὸ ἐπιβάλλον μέρος τῆς οὐσίας*, *the portion of goods that falleth to me*, *der zufallende Theil des Vermögens*. And even if we take *οὐσία* in the sense of *existence*, *ἐπιούσιος* might still be explained: *needful* or *sufficient for our existence*. Jos. Mede observes that the petition may be thus paraphrased: *τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν, μὴ περιούσιον* (not abundant or superfluous), *ἀλλὰ τὸν ἐπιούσιον* (but sufficient) *δὸς ἡμῖν σήμερον*. He identifies the *ἄρτος ἐπιούσιος* with the *lehem huki* in Agur's prayer, Prov. xxx. 8, and derives this petition from it. So Lange in Com.—*Bread*, like the Hebrew לֶחֶם, is a synecdoche for everything necessary to sustain life, comp. Gen. xliii. 25, 31, 34.—P. S.]

[7] Ver. 12.—*Text. rec.: ἀφίεμεν*, which is sufficiently sustained. For *ἀφήκαμεν* are Cod. B. Z. and ancient fathers. Perhaps it arose from liturgical arrangements (the reconciliation of men before the holy communion).

[8] Ver. 13.—The doxology [from: "*For Thine—Amen*"] is omitted in B. D. Z., etc. [Alford *ad loc.* says: "The *doxology* must on every ground of sound criticism be omitted. . . . We find absolutely no trace of it in early times, in any family of MSS. or in any expositions." But on the other hand the Peschito already has it, and Stier eloquently defends it, though on subjective grounds. It was probably inserted in the beginning of the 4th century from the liturgies and the *primitive habit* of the Christians in praying the Lord's Prayer. Comp. Com. below.—P. S.]

[9] Ver. 18.—*ἐν τῷ φανερῷ* is omitted in many Codd., as in ver. 4.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Having exposed the corruptions of doctrine, our Lord exhibits those of religious life under three examples, which present the three great forms in which the self-righteousness and hypocrisy of the Pharisees and scribes manifested itself. They were, *alms-giving*, *prayer*, and *fasting*. These were the three principal manifestations of practical piety among the Jews (Tobias xii. 8, 9; xiv. 10; Judith iv. 9; Sirach xxix. 11), and were abused by the Pharisees to exhibit their superior piety.* The Church of Rome still designates them as good works in a pre-eminent sense. The Pharisees imagined that they had reached the highest eminence in these three phases of spiritual life, which mark a right relationship *toward our neighbor* (alms-giving), toward *God* (prayer), and toward *ourselves* (fasting); while their spirit of bondage and hypocrisy entirely destroyed the spiritual character of these works, and morally placed them on a level with the saddest and most sinful perversions of the heathen.

Ver. 1. **Your righteousness** [not: **your alms**].—We read *δικαιοσύνην*, and not *ἐλεημοσύνην*, with Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, and others, according to Codd. B. D., etc. *Righteousness*, צְדָקָה, is upright and pious conduct generally. Thus we have in the first verse a description of righteousness generally, which afterward is followed by a statement of the threefold manifestation of that righteousness. The reward with our Father who is in heaven (Matt. xxv. 31, etc.) is mentioned in opposition to that which the Pharisees arrogated to themselves, or to the outward acknowledgment which they claimed from men.

Ver. 2. **When thou doest alms, do not sound a trumpet before thee.**—A figurative expression, meaning, *to attract attention*. So Theophylact and many other commentators. Calovius, Wolf, Paulus, etc., understand it literally, that the Pharisees gathered the poor together by sounding a trumpet. Others connect it with the modern custom of beggars in the East, who blow the trumpet before him from whom they ask alms (Henneberg). Lastly, some refer it to the clinking of the money in the chest, which is supposed to have been shaped like a trumpet. Manifestly the metaphorical interpretation alone is correct.—In the synagogues the alms were collected; on the streets the benevolent were accosted by beggars. These additions, then, only indicate the occasion. The emphasis rests on the *μὴ σαλπίσῃς*.—**They have their reward.**—*Ἀπέχουσιν*, they have it in full, or have wholly received their reward [and will get no more]: The only thing they wished was the praise of the multitude; and that they have got in all its vanity.—The expression *ὑποκριτής* occurs frequently in the Gospels, as in ver. 16, vii. 16, and in other places. The verb *ὑποκρίνεσθαι* (Luke xx. 20) has much the same signification as *ἀποκρίνεσθαι*, *to answer*, but probably to answer under a mask, to play the actor, *to feign*. "In the New Testament it is applied to a form of religion, where the reality is awanting."

Ver. 3. **Let not thy left hand know.**—"Not a parsimonious counting of the money from the right hand into the left (Paulus, de Wette), nor a searching to take away again with the left hand (Luther); but complete modesty, secret and noiseless giving, metaphorically expressed (Chrysostom)." Gerlach: "If the left hand does not know what the right hand does, neither is the soul which animates both conscious of it." We can find no sense in this explanation, and prefer his quotation of an Eastern proverb: "If thou doest any good, cast it into the sea: if the fish shall not know it, the Lord knows it."*—**He who sees in secret**, or who is ever present. *Αὐτός*, *He*. You are not to take your own reward: He will give it you. A reward of grace this, in the kingdom of God.

Ver. 5. **And when ye pray.**—On many grounds we prefer the plural instead of the singular (see Lachmann, etc.).—**They love to pray.** Their position in prayer is a matter of reflection and of choice, and they love it so.—**Standing.** "The Jews prayed standing with their face toward the temple, or toward the most holy place,—1 Sam. i. 26; 1 Kings viii. 22; Mark xi. 25; Luke xviii. 11; Lightfoot, *Horæ*, 292 sq.—or else kneeling, or prostrate on the earth."—Meyer. But the word *ἑστῶτες* indicates a conscious

* Even in Tobias iv. 11, 12, alms are represented as righteousness before God, and as the means of obtaining forgiveness. In the ancient Church they were regarded as means of indulgence. Comp. the Sermons of Leo the Great. See Heubner, p. 78.

* ["*Thust du was Gutes, so wirf es in's Meer,*
Weiss es der Fisch nicht, so weiss es der Herr."]

and ostentatious assumption of the posture; comp. Luke xviii. 11, ὁ Φαρισαῖος σταθείς.—**In the corners,** ἐν ταῖς γωνίαις. The Pharisees probably took care that the hour fixed for prayer should overtake them at a cross-road or the corner of a street, in order to afford them the desired opportunity of performing their devotions in the most public places.

Ver. 6. **Into thy closet,** εἰς τὸ ταμεῖόν σου.—The room specially used for prayer was called ὑπερῷον, the Alijah, on the house-top. Vitringa, *Syn.* 151. Although this apartment is not exclusively here referred to, there is evidently an allusion to it, as being pre-eminently "*the* closet" of a Jew when engaged in devotional exercises. The antithesis between "*the closet*," and "*the synagogue and corners of streets*," is manifest. Of course, the passage is not aimed against public prayer. As Theophylact has it: ὁ τόπος οὐ βλάπτει, ἀλλ' ὁ τρόπος, καὶ ὁ σκόπος [it is not the place which hurts, but the manner and the aim]. All display should be avoided in devotion: He who addresses God must be wholly engrossed with thoughts of his own wants, and of Him whose grace he entreats. Such abstraction will convert the most public place into a ταμεῖον. The metaphorical expression, κλείσας τὴν θύραν, also refers to the latent desire of gaining the applause of men.

Ver. 7. **Use not vain repetitions,** μὴ βαττολογήσητε.—Another perversion of prayer closely connected with the former, and implying an attempt to gain merit before God by superstitious practices, just as the former abuse was intended to gain merit with men. Βαττολογεῖν occurs very rarely in classical writers (Simplic. ad Epict. p. 340). It has been variously derived from Battus, the name of a king who stammered, or from Battus, a poet whose compositions were full of tautologies, or from בַּדִּים, Job xi. 3. Probably it is, as Hesychius suggests, an onomatopoëticon, after the analogy of βατταρίζειν,—an imitation of stammering, and then of garrulity. The explanation of its meaning is furnished by the expression, **much speaking,** πολυλογία, which follows. These vain repetitions of the heathen are alluded to in 1 Kings xviii. 26; Terent. *Heautont.* v. 1.—On the vain repetitions of the Jews, *see* Matt. xxiii. 15; Sir. vii. 14; Wetstein, Schöttgen, and others;—on those of the Mohammedans, Hottinger, *Hist. Eccles.* vii. ad Lectorem.—The vain repetitions of the mediæval Church (Gieseler, *Kirchengesch.* ii. 1. p. 294), and of some modern sects, are well known.

It is worthy of notice, that Christ ranks beneficence and fasting along with prayer as religious actions, and as the evidence of practical piety. This implies, that almsgiving and fasting are the necessary accompaniment and manifestation of true prayer, which, so to speak, stands intermediate between them; the spirit of prayer being reflected in attention to the wants of our indigent brethren, and to those of our own inner life. The inferences from this are, 1. that almsgiving, in the spiritual sense, does not merely consist in care for the temporal wants of the poor, by the instrumentality of established boards and committees, but must take form after the example which the Lord Himself gave when He relieved the wants of the needy; 2. that religious fasting cannot be reduced merely to principles of temperance, sobriety, and order, but forms a distinct and special exercise, which, however, must be reserved for special eras in our lives, or for seasons of peculiar experience.

Vers. 9-13. **The Lord's Prayer.**—*General Remarks.*—In this prayer our Lord shows His disciples how an infinite variety of wants and requests can be compressed into a few humble petitions. It embodies every possible desire of a praying heart, a whole world of spiritual requirements, yet all in the most simple, condensed, and humble form, resembling in this respect a pearl on which the light of heaven plays. It expresses and combines, in the best order, *every Divine promise, every human sorrow and want,* and *every Christian aspiration* for the good of others. In the opening address we have Theism in its purest manifestation, which ever owns and recognises the God of heaven as our Father. From the three first petitions, in their relation to the succeeding ones, we learn that man must not be bent on entreating God merely for that which affects himself, but that his spiritual well-being will be promoted by self-surrender to God, and by primarily seeking that which pertains to His kingdom.

The Lord's Prayer is commonly arranged into three parts—the *preface,* the *petitions,* and the *conclusion* (*see* Luther's Smaller Catechism, the Heidelberg Cat., qu. 120 sqq., and the Westminster Cats.). Then follows the arrangement of the separate petitions. Bengel: *Petita sunt septem, quæ universa dividuntur in duas partes. Prior continet tria priora, Patrem spectantia: tuum, tuum, tua; posterior quatuor reliqua, nos spectantia.*—Olshausen: Viewed as a whole, the prayer contains only one idea, even deep longing after the kingdom of God, which forms the substance of all the prayers of the children of God (for whose behoof Christ here gives us a model). But this one idea is set forth under a twofold aspect. In the first three petitions it is presented to us in the light of God's relation to men, exhibiting the kingdom of God absolutely and in its perfectness,—the final aim of God being always the burden of the believer's desire. The four succeeding petitions, on the other hand, bear reference to the obstacles in the way of the kingdom of heaven, and present this spiritual longing of the children of God in the light of the existing relation between man and God. Hence it is that in the first part of the Lord's Prayer the infinite riches of God are unfolded:—

Hallowed be *Thy* name;
Thy kingdom come;
Thy will be done;

While in the second part, the poverty of men is brought to view:

Give *us* this day our daily bread;
Forgive *us* our debts;
Lead *us* not into temptation;
Deliver *us* from evil.

Lastly, the rich doxology expresses the certain hope that our prayers shall be heard, in view of the character of God, who, being Himself the highest good, will also bring to pass the highest good, even His own kingdom. The Lord's Prayer is, at the same time, the utterance of the desires of individual believers, although the plural number in the petitions indicates their feeling of fellowship with others, and that of the aspirations of mankind generally. Expressing as it does the inmost feelings and wants of humanity, and the relation between God and sinful man, it both meets the requirements of all, and satisfies the desires of the individual, provided his be a life of faith. Every special request not directly connected with things that pass away, but bearing on what is eternal, is included and implied in the Lord's Prayer."—De Wette: "The sacred number of these

petitions—seven—indicates that they exhaust every religious want. In the first three petitions, the soul rises directly to God; in the three following, we have the hinderances to these aspirations—from a feeling of dependence upon what is earthly, and from a conflict with sin; while the last petition sets before us the solution of all these difficulties."—Somewhat better Meyer: "*Having risen* to what forms the highest and holiest object of believers, the soul is engrossed with its character (first petition), its grand purpose (second petition), and its moral condition (third petition); in the fourth petition, the children of God *humble themselves* under the consciousness of their dependence upon Divine mercy even in temporal matters, but much more in spiritual things, since that which, according to the first portion of this prayer, constituted the burden of desire, can only be realized by forgiveness (fifth petition), by gracious guidance (sixth petition), and deliverance from the power of the devil (seventh petition)."—Stier (i. 198) draws a parallel between the two tables of the Decalogue and the two sections of the Lord's Prayer.—Weber (Lat. Programme quoted by Tholuck, p. 360) suggests the following outline:—

Πρόλογος.	Λόγος.		Ἐπίλογος.
	Εὐχαί.	Αἰτήματα.	
1. Πάτερ.	1. ἁγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου.	1. τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν, κ.τ.λ.	1. ὅτι σοῦ ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία.
2. ἡμῶν.	2. ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου.	2. καὶ ἄφες ἡμῖν, κ.τ.λ.	2. σοῦ ἐστιν ἡ δύναμις.
3. ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.	3. γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου, κ.τ.λ.	3. καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς, κ.τ.λ.	3. σοῦ ἐστιν ἡ δόξα.

Tholuck: "The attentive reader, who has otherwise learned the doctrine of the Trinity, will find a distinct reference to it in the arrangement of this prayer. The first petition in each of the first and second portions of the prayer, refers to God as the Creator and Preserver; the second, to God the Redeemer; and the third, to God the Holy Spirit."—*Devotion* to God, and *acceptance* of His gifts are contrasted in the Lord's Prayer. 1. Devotion *to His name, to His kingdom, and to His will;* heaven, heaven and earth, earth: the place of His manifestation. 2. Acceptance of His gifts in reference to the *present*, the *past*, and the *future*.—We place in parallel columns the seven petitions and the seven beatitudes, to exhibit their internal agreement:—

1. Blessed are the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.	—Hallowed be Thy name (the name of God our riches, opening to us the kingdom of heaven).
2. Blessed are they that mourn: for they shall be comforted.	—Thy kingdom come (and with it comes heavenly comfort to our hearts).
3. Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth.	—Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven (meekness, the characteristic of heaven, the outstanding feature of the new earth).
4. Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after righteousness: for they shall be filled.	—Give us this day our daily bread (which above all includes the Bread of life, John vi.).
5. Blessed are the merciful: for they shall obtain mercy.	—And forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors.
6. Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God.	—And lead us not into temptation (grant us victory in our hearts).
7. Blessed are the peacemakers, etc.	—But deliver us from evil (grant victory over the world).

It has been remarked, that the Lord Jesus simply taught His *disciples* to pray, "Forgive us our debts," but could not Himself have offered that petition (comp. Tholuck, p. 375). If we take it literally, this is, of course, true; though we must always bear in mind, that in the depth of His human sympathy, Christ felt more than any other the sins of humanity, and that He entreated their forgiveness as that of a debt due by the whole family of man.

Ver. 9. **After this manner therefore pray ye.**—According to Schleiermacher, Olshausen, de Wette, and Neander, Christ taught His disciples the Lord's Prayer, not on this, but on a later occasion (Luke xi. 1). Tholuck and Stier hold that the Lord's Prayer was, so to speak, twice taught: the first time as an example how to pray without vain repetitions; the second time, when His disciples expressly asked Him, "Lord, teach us to pray." But this explanation is forced, and at variance with Christ's ordinary mode of instruction, which was always in the first place directed to the disciples, and then to the people. But if we call up before our minds that inner circle to which the Sermon on the Mount was first addressed, we can readily understand how the disciples would on that occasion proffer such a request. **After this manner,** *οὕτως*.—In what respect *οὕτως? Grotius: in hunc sensum.* Calovius, Maldonatus, Fritzsche, Tholuck, Meyer: *in this manner, i. e.,* thus *briefly.* De Wette: in these words, as a *formula* of prayer. We may call it a formula, provided we remember that its leading characteristic is to be free from πολυλογία and formality, and that in briefest form it bodies forth the deepest and the fullest thoughts and feelings. And as, in the present case, contents and form agree in this respect, the word *οὕτως* refers equally to the rich vein of thought, and to the concise brevity of form in this prayer.*

* [Among British and American commentators those belonging to the Presbyterian, Congregational, Methodist, Baptist, and other non-Episcopal denominations generally maintain that the Lord's Prayer was intended not as a *formula* to be literally and invariably used, although it is undoubtedly very proper to use it within certain limits, but as a *general pattern* rather for all our prayers, private and public. *See* Henry, Barnes, Alexander, Owen, Jacobus, Whedon, Nast *ad Matt.* vi. 9. Episcopalian commentators differ like the Germans. Dr. Alford (a liberal Anglican) says: "It is very improbable that the prayer was regarded in the very earliest times as a set form delivered for liturgical use by our Lord. The variations of τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν· καὶ γὰρ αὐτοὶ ἀφίομεν παντὶ ὀφείλοντι ἡμῖν, and τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν in Luke, for the corresponding clauses in our text, however unimportant in themselves, have been regarded as fatal to the supposition of its being used liturgically at the time when these Gospels were written. It must be confessed that we find very few traces of such use in early times." Dr. Wordsworth (conservative Anglican) on the other hand remarks *ad Matt.* vi. 9: "Our Lord here, by this prayer (comp. the Benediction, Num. vi. 23; Deut. xxvi. 13) authorizes *forms* of prayer (and adopts petitions already in use in Forms of Prayer among the Jews), and delivers a particular *form* of prayer to be used, and to serve

On the resemblance between this prayer and other Jewish prayers, comp. Heubner (p. 87), Tholuck, and de Wette. "It derogates in no way from the Lord's Prayer, that to a certain extent it embodies ideas expressed in other Jewish prayers, since it was not a mere repetition of these forms. Nay, in the circumstances, it would have been surprising if every such allusion had been avoided. But Wetstein goes much too far in maintaining, '*tota hæc oratio ex formulis Hebræorum concinnata est.*' After Lightfoot, Schöttgen, Wetstein, Drusius, Vitringa, Witsius, and Surenhusius have laid under requisition every conceivable parallel passage, even from much later Jewish prayer books, the result of their learning and industry shows that only the first two petitions of the Lord's prayer contain what, after all, amounts to no more than allusions to well-known Old Testament or Messianic ideas and expressions. Besides, it is quite possible that the Jews may have borrowed even these from the Lord's Prayer." De Wette.—Nor should it be forgotten that the characteristic features of this prayer consist in the brevity and distinctness of its petitions, in their order and succession, and lastly, in their fulness and comprehensiveness.

With reference to the criticism of the *text*, Olshausen remarks: "The doxology at the close is undoubtedly of later origin, and added for liturgical purposes. It first appears in the Constit. Apost., where it reads, ὅτι σοῦ ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία εἰς αἰῶνας. Ἀμήν. But its meaning is so deep and so much in accordance with the spirit of the prayer, that it must have originated at a period when the genuine spirit of the apostolic Church still prevailed. It is wanting in Codd. B. D. L. (Z.), and in many others, as shown by Griesbach. But it occurs already in the Peshito, where, however, it may be an interpolation. Similarly the petitions, γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ (τῆς) γῆς, and ἀλλὰ ῥῦσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ, are wanting in the text of Luke. They are not found in B. and L., nor do they occur in the oldest of the Fathers—such as Origen, who expressly mentions the omission. But it does not follow that they are spurious in the prayer as given by Matthew. In all likelihood, Luke simply abbreviated the account." Similarly, some read only πάτερ in the opening address.—On the transposition of the second and third petitions in Tertullian, *see* Dr. Nitzsch in the "*Studien und Kritiken*" for 1830, iv. 846.

After Augustine and Luther, the *number* of the petitions has been fixed at *seven*. But Chrysostom, and after him the Reformed Churches, enumerate only *six*. It cannot be denied that the petition, "*Deliver us from evil*," expresses more than that, "*Lead us not into temptation;*" and in this respect it may be regarded as a separate petition. On the other hand, however, it must not be overlooked, that the word ἀλλά connects the two parts of one and the same petition.* Besides, symbolically, we should expect to find the number six rather than seven—the former being expressive of mental labor, the latter of holy rest. Viewed as a sacred number, six is always followed by a seven, which sums up the whole; just as in this case the six petitions are summed up in the doxology, or originally in the close of the sixth petition, or in the continuous inward prayer of believers,—concerning which Luther rightly says, "The Christian prays a never-ending Lord's prayer."

Ver. 9. **Our Father,** πάτερ ἡμῶν.—Although the spiritual experience of adoption sprung from the atoning death of Christ on the cross, it was from the first implied in Christ's message of reconciliation.—**Who art in the heavens,** ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. The words show the infinite difference between this and every other human relationship of a similar kind: Our Father *in heaven;* not a weak, helpless, earthly parent (comp. ch. vii. 11; Eph. iii. 15; iv. 6). The expression also indicates the place where the glory of God dwelleth (Isa. lxvi. 1; Acts vii. 55, 56, etc.), but without the limitations of the Old Testament—not in heaven, but in *the heavens.* Finally, it is both a symbol of the contrast between the glory, the purity, the infinitude, and the unchangeableness of heaven and this world, and of the riches of God, and the source whence the kingdom of heaven descended upon earth.

Thy name.—The expression refers neither to His Divine being, nor to His perfections; as in that case the petition, "*Hallowed* be Thy name," would be unintelligible. What *is* holy cannot be *made* holy. The "*name* of God" is the impress of His being upon the human mind, the manifestation of His being in the world; hence nearly equivalent to religion as based upon Divine revelation. Comp. 1 Pet. iii. 15: "Sanctify the Lord God in your hearts."

Ver. 10. **Thy kingdom.**—The kingdom of heaven. As Christ announces and introduces the kingdom of heaven, so His people are to pray for, and to anticipate it. The import of the expression, "kingdom of heaven," appears, 1. from its contrast to the symbolical kingdom of heaven under the O. T. theocracy; 2. from its contrast to the kingdom of darkness. Other explanations: The spread of Christianity (Kuinoel); the victorious development of the Christian Church (Tholuck). But these are only individual phases; the grand fact is the kingdom of heaven in its spiritual reality, which includes both time and eternity.†

As in heaven,—*i. e.*, in absolute purity and perfectness, as apparent in the obedience of the angels.

as a pattern for the subject and order of our desires and prayers, and therefore as a guide for our practice."—There is truth here on both sides. This matchless prayer was undoubtedly given both as a *form* to be rightly, *i. e.*, devoutly and reverently used on all proper occasions (comp. the λέγετε in Luke xi. 2), and as a *model* for all other prayers. The former abuse of the Lord's Prayer as an empty formula oft repeated without devotion and profit in the Roman Church (hence Luther called it the *greatest martyr*), led some sections of Protestantism to the opposite extreme of neglect of this shortest and richest, simplest and deepest of all prayers ever uttered by man or angel, the perfect model prayer which could only proceed from the lips of the Son of God. Dr. Thomas Scott has hit the right medium in the following note: "It may often be [better: it undoubtedly *is*] *proper* to use the very words, but it is not always *necessary;* for we do not find that the apostles thus used it: but we ought always to pray after the *manner* of it, that is, with that reverence, humility, seriousness, confidence in God, zeal for His glory, love to mankind, submission, and moderation in temporal, and earnestness about spiritual things, which it inculcates; avoiding vain repetitions, and using grave and comprehensive expressions." Comp. also the remarks of Ad. Clarke, and Dr. D. Brown *ad loc.*—P. S.]

* [Alford takes a similar view: "ἀλλά must not be taken as equivalent to εἰ δὲ μή, q. d. '*but if thou dost, deliver*,' etc.; but is rather the opposition to the former clause, and forms in this sense but one petition with it,—'*bring us not into conflict with evil, but rather deliver* (rid) *us from it altogether.*' In another view, however, as expressing the deep desire of all Christian hearts to be delivered from *all evil* . . . these words form a seventh and most affecting petition, reaching far beyond the last." So also D. Brown *ad loc.*—P. S.]

† [Alford: "'THY KINGDOM' here is the fulness of the accomplishment of the kingdom of God, so often spoken of in prophetic Scripture; and by implication all that process of events which lead to that accomplishment. Meyer in objecting to all ecclesiastical and spiritual meanings of 'Thy kingdom,' forgets that the one for which he contends exclusively, *the Messianic kingdom*, does in fact include or imply them all."—P. S.]

Ver. 11. **Our daily bread,**—ἄρτος, like לֶחֶם, the requirements of daily life.—Τὸν ἐπιούσιον occurs again in Luke xi. 3, but nowhere else. Explanations:—1. The nourishment necessary for subsistence, οὐσία. So Origen and many others. "This explanation [says Meyer] has led to the inaccurate rendering, '*daily bread*' (the Vulgate, Chrysostom, Luther, etc.)." Meyer objects that οὐσία does not mean subsistence, but *being* or *existence*. But surely the subsistence of a man consists in the preservation of his human being. 2. Jerome and Zwingli: "*Epiusion, hoc est supersubstantialem petamus, plus de animæ cibo, quam corporis solliciti.*" Of course it were a mistake to apply the passage, with Olshausen and some of the Fathers, to spiritual nourishment exclusively, or even to the Eucharist. Manifestly, our Lord alludes to daily bread—only not to merely material bread, destined for the sensuous part of man alone. Man requires earthly bread; the Christian, Christian bread, yet not supersensuous, but adapted to all the parts of his being, which implies, above all, heavenly and spiritual nourishment. 3. By some the word is identified with ἐπιοῦσα, *dies crastinus*—*to-morrow's* bread. So the Arabic and Ethiopian versions, Scaliger, Meyer, etc. (Jerome: *in Evangelio, quod appellatur secundum Hebræos, pro supersubstantiali pane reperi* **mahar,** מחר, *i. e., to-morrow's bread.*) But this explanation agrees not with σήμερον, nor with the statement in vi. 34.—Explaining it as referring to bread suitable to our being, we include in the term the idea of what is required for our daily subsistence, corresponding to לֶחֶם חֻקִּי ("food convenient for me"), in Prov. xxx. 8.*

Ver. 12. **Debts,** ὀφειλήματα,—equivalent to παραπτώματα, regarding them either in the light of imputation, or of one's own conscience.

As we forgive.—Ὡς expresses neither the measure (Baumgarten-Crusius) nor the ground of forgiveness (*nam*, Fritsche, Meyer), but indicates the relation to our feelings of conciliation toward our neighbor; the assurance of our own forgiveness being connected with and regulated by our vow of readiness to forgive our neighbors. We feel assurance in Thy forgiveness, perceiving within ourselves a readiness to forgive others, which Thou hast implanted; and we pray for forgiveness while vowing, under a sense of this gracious experience.

Ver. 13. **And lead us not into temptation.**—A difficult passage: 1. Because God does not tempt man, James i. 13; 2. because man should not shrink from trial. Hence some have taken εἰσφέρειν, others εἰς, and others πειρασμός, in an emphatic sense. But the "*temptation*" here spoken of is only a trial *increased* by the guilt which had formerly been confessed as a debt; and the prayer, "*Lead us not,*" is simply a consequence of the petition for forgiveness. Let us not experience in intense temptations the consequences of our guilt, etc. (comp. *L. Jesu*, ii. 2, p. 615). The popular sense is, that God may preserve us from such temptations as might lead us into sin (ch. xxvi. 41; 1 Cor. vii. 5); or else that God would, with the temptation, give a way of escape, 1 Cor. x. 13.

But deliver us from evil, ῥῦσαι ἡμᾶς.—The full sense of both these petitions can only be understood if we bear in mind the literal meaning of εἰσφέρειν and ῥύομαι—to *carry in*, and to *pull out*. The expression, pulling out, or delivering, implies bondage and inability.—Ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ. Explanations: 1. ὁ πονηρός, the Evil One, the Devil. So the older commentators, Erasmus, Beza, Kuinoel, Fritzsche, Meyer. 2. τὸ πονηρόν. So Augustine and Tholuck, after John xvii. 15; Rom. xii. 9; 2 Thess. iii. 3. 3. From evil, or misery. Luther.—If by πονηρόν the power of darkness is meant, as manifested in the kingdom of darkness, it would include not only that kingdom itself, but also its author, and even its outward and temporal consequences. Such is undoubtedly the meaning of the text. "The whole sphere and bearing of the πειρασμοί," Tholuck.

For thine is the kingdom.—This doxology is traced back to 1 Chron. xxix. 11.—2 Tim. iv. 18 may be regarded as containing the germ of this liturgical addition to the text, although, according to Stier, it only serves as an evidence of the genuineness of the passage in Matthew. The words show that the fulness of God, or His majesty, forms the *basis*, the *soul*, and the *aim* of the whole prayer. On the foundation of the kingdom of power, which rests in God's might and appears in His glory, the kingdom of grace is to be unfolded and perfected. [*See Addenda.*]

Amen, אָמֵן *certainly, truly.*—This certainty is derived from the truth and faithfulness of God (אֱמוּנָה). Christ introduces His most solemn statements with this word; and with it believers close their prayers, in sign and testimony that all human faithfulness and human certitude springs from the faithfulness of God. This word, *Amen*, has its great history in biblical theology, in the Divine services of the Church, and in the lives of believers. But at the close of the Lord's Prayer, "the Amen of every prayer anticipates that of the world." (Stier.)

Ver. 14. **For if ye forgive men.** Comp. Mark xi. 25.—An explanation of the fifth petition, specially important in this place, as showing that forgiveness and readiness to forgive were among the leading ideas in the Lord's Prayer. This was all the more necessary, as the Lord could not yet speak of the work of redemption which He was about to accomplish. De Wette is right in observing, that the circumstance of His not adverting to it, is itself an evidence of the authenticity of the Lord's Prayer.—Τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν. After Cod. D. and other witnesses, Tischendorf has omitted these words, though without sufficient reason.

Ver. 16. **When ye fast.**—This refers primarily to voluntary or private fasting, Luke xviii. 12. But it equally applies to the great annual public fast, Lev. xvi. 29. "By the law of Moses, the Jews were enjoined to fast on the Day of Atonement from one evening to the following (Lev. xvi. 29). Tradition prescribed similar fasts in autumn if the latter rains did not fall, or if the harvest was threatened (*Taanith*, p. iii. § 8). To these we have to add a number of extraordinary fasts. The Pharisees regarded the practice as meritorious, and fasted twice (Luke xviii. 12), or even four times, in the week,—making their appearance in the synagogue, negligently attired, pale and sad, in order to exhibit their superior ascetic sanctity

* [Alford takes ἐπιούσιος likewise in the sense: *proper for our sustenance*, after the analogy of ἐπίγαμος, *fit for marriage*, ἐπιδόρπιος, *fit for the banquet*, and considers it equivalent to τὰ ἐπιτήδεια τοῦ σώματος in James ii. 16 (rendered in Syriac transl. by the same word). He also thinks we may safely understand the expression spiritually, of the bread of life, provided we keep in the foreground its primary physical meaning, and view the other as involved by implication in that. The Anglican Catech. understands the daily bread to mean "all things that be needful for our souls and bodies." On the different explanations, *see* especially Tholuck, Meyer, and Conant.—P. S.]

before the people." Von Ammon.—It was the practice to wear mourning-dresses when fasting. Σκυθρωποί, Luke xxiv. 17; Gen. xl. 7.—**Disfigure,** ἀφανίζειν, with ashes and dust, Isa. lxi. 3. Here a figurative expression for the mournful gestures and the neglected appearance of the head and beard.—"There is a play upon the words, ἀφανίζουσι and φανῶσι. They make their faces *unappearable*, that they may *appear* unto men." So Meyer, who also suggests that the expression alludes to the covering of the face, as in 2 Sam. xv. 30; Esther vi. 12.

Ver. 17. **Anoint thine head.**—In the East, it was customary to *anoint* the head when going to a feast, in opposition to the deportment observed on fast days. Hence the advice must not be taken literally. Of course, the *opposite* dissimulation cannot have been enjoined. Our outward appearance when fasting is to betoken spiritual triumph and rest, which elevates above mere outward abstinence.

Ver. 18. **In secret.**—Ἐν τῷ κρυφαίῳ [twice for the *text rec.*, ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ.]—So Lachmann and Tischendorf after B. D. The word does not again occur in the New Testament, but is several times found in the Septuagint. [This note belongs properly to the critical notes below the text.—P. S.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The one radical perversion of religious life consists in the desire *to appear* before men. Spiritual religion has, indeed, its outward and becoming expression,—chiefly, however, in the meek and devout worship of the Church, where the piety of individual believers is lost to outward view. The *worship of the Church* is, so to speak, the shadow in which the humility and meekness of the individual worshipper finds shelter and protection.

Hence perversion of religious life first manifests itself in separatism of worship, which gradually intrudes upon the worship of the Church, and ultimately perverts it. The consequences of this speedily appear in the three departments of practical piety. Thus, instead of charity toward our neighbors, we have religious self-righteousness on the one hand, and religious idleness on the other—a show of kindness, and a corresponding spirit of mean dependence. Similarly, the worship of God assumes the form of lengthened prayers and tedious processions without devotion, while asceticism degenerates into hypocritical fasts and monastic extravagances. But if, in our religion, we consciously and purposely aim after mere externalism and show, we enter upon a course of hypocrisy, setting up in our outward forms a counterfeit of what is sacred. The commencement of this false religionism consists in painful service and outward works. Although a man may at that stage still set God before him, it is only in an external manner. In worshipping Him, he no longer has regard to the character and the love of God, because he realizes not that God has regard to his affections and state of heart. He is only anxious that God should have regard to his work, and his service, just as he has only regard to the work of God and the reward of God; and as he regards this reward as merely external, like his own work, he gradually comes to seek it among men. His externalism now leads him to merge his God in the opinion of men. Hence the outward show which marks the second stage of religious perversion. His great object now is to let his beneficence, his prayers, and his fasts appear as fully and as pompously as possible. From this spiritual pride and spiritual servility the transition is easy to the third stage, which is that of deception and imposition, when the hypocrite conceals his hardness of heart under the mask of beneficence, his coldness and deadness under that of singular devotion, and his love of the world and lustfulness, with the corresponding works of darkness, under that of asceticism.

2. A piety which primarily tends to externalism and show, is not only falsehood but folly. It may be compared to a root growing upward. The proper and genuine tendency of religion is *inward*, to *secrecy*—to that God who rules in the secret sanctuary of spiritual life. Hence also Christ urges in so strenuous terms the importance of this matter. Let beneficence remain a secret of our right hand—a shamefaced and holy affection—an act of genuine pity, from which we immediately pass without self-complacency. Let true prayer be concealed in our closet, and let us shut the door behind us. Let sincere fasting be concealed under the cheerful garb of holy festivity. This concealment is necessary, because true piety consists in full self-surrender to God, leading us to seek His, not ours; and because we cherish the firm confidence, that the Lord will own openly, by His leadings and by His blessings, in the domain of moral and of public life, in the kingdom of heaven here, and yet more hereafter, whatever is done in and for His name, and that He will in His own time and way attest both its reality and its value. Thus the root spreads deep in the earth where no human eye sees, in the assured hope that it shall spring all the higher, and spread all the more richly, in measure as its life is hid beneath the ground.

3. In this instance also the Lord sets before His disciples a picture which reflected His own life. In the gracious dispensation of His benefits, He alike removed the occasion of mendicancy and avoided the pomp of spurious kindness. By His intercession, He restored the life-tree of humanity, by restoring its root, and planting it in good soil, even in God. So also He fasted and renounced the world as the Bridegroom of the Church,—thereby and therein laying anew the foundation of true enjoyment and peace.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Outward manifestations of piety, genuine and spurious: 1. Genuine, if springing from within, and an evidence of what is within: or if in them man seeks God, lives in God, and desires to glorify God; 2. spurious, if in contrariety to the state of the heart, if carried on to the detriment of our inner man, or leading to his ruin; lastly, if man seek his own glory in divine things.—True and false outward manifestations: 1. True,—the destiny of Adam; false,—the fall. 2. True,—Christ's advent; false,—the state of the world at the time. 3. Acknowledged by God as true,—the bride of Christ; condemned as false in the final judgment,—the Babylonish harlot.—How false appearances have rendered life hollow, and how they threaten to render hollow the life of the Church.—Spiritual vanity tending toward spiritual pride, and thus exposing men to greatest danger. But if we have sounded the depths of life, we will not become giddy on its heights.—Externalism in individual members of the Church may give rise to externalism in the Church, or to carnal chiliasm: 1. Proof from history,—the Pharisees were chiliasts, and yet they crucified the Lord of glory; 2. from the nature of the thing,—when many are seized with the spirit of externalism, they will be anxious to form a Church

pretending to outward perfectness, but which in reality is only a Church of outward appearance; 3. from the diversity of this morbid externalism in the Church: with some it manifests itself in works; with others, in devotions; with others, in pretended asceticism.—Make sure that you give yourself wholly to God, and in due time He will own you.—Take care of the root; and the leaves, the blossoms, and the fruit will appear in due season.—In what way may art, with its fair appearance, be rendered subservient to Christian truth?—Hypocrisy is religious play-acting.—Whatever we may have or want, let us eschew anything like religious comedy in the Church.—Who can dispense with false appearances? 1. He who firmly trusts in the living God. 2. He who sincerely cleaves to the truth. 3. He who patiently waits for the day of the appearing of the Lord.—Let us exhibit before men, not our own righteousness, but the light which we have received from the Lord.—The three great virtues of hypocrites are only splendid vices.—The three great graces of saints are secrets with the Lord.—Piety seeking concealment in its principal outward manifestations: 1. The open hand; 2. the door of the closet *shut*; 3. the countenance open, yet veiled.—The right hand in its wonderworking, or our beneficence restoring the poor.—Pure beneficence: pure poverty.—The door of the closet shut, yet open: 1. Open to God, closed to the world; 2. open to any one who would join us in prayer, closed to mere idle onlookers; 3. open to the kingdom of heaven, closed to the kingdom of darkness.—True prayer will everywhere find a closet.—True fasting a joyous renunciation of the world.—The Father who sees in secret, and the open reward.—The reward which man takes to himself: 1. A theft; 2. a robbery; 3. a self-deception.—The reward which God bestows: 1. a reward of grace; 2. a reward of love; 3. a spiritual reward; 4. a reward of eternal life.—The progress of hypocrisy: 1. *Service of works*, when man loses sight of the character and the love of God whom he serves, and forgets or denies that the God whom he serves looks to the heart and affections of him who offers worship. 2. *Mere outward service*, where externalism takes the place of real service, and yet even professed externalism is rendered impossible by a show of service. 3. *Service of sin*, when devotion, becomes a lie, which is speedily overtaken by judgment.—Progress of piety from concealment to open manifestation: 1. It is a secret between the Lord and the hearts of believers, hid from the eyes of the world. 2. The light which proceedeth from Him who is invisible, shines through the hearts of believers into the world, and becomes manifest there. 3. The divine life fully manifested in the great day of revelation.

The Lord's Prayer, as the prayer of Christian believers.—The Lord's Prayer a precious jewel, which reflects the light of Christianity: 1. The teaching of the Gospel; 2. the life of the Lord; 3. His grace; 4. the discipline of the Spirit of Christ; 5. the power of the new life; 6. the history of the kingdom of God.—The Lord's Prayer, as expressing our adoption and reconciliation: 1. There the promises of God and our requirements meet; 2. there the ways of God and our ways meet; 3. there the Amen of God responds to our Amen.—The sad state of Christendom, as appearing in connection with the Lord's Prayer: 1. It was intended against vain repetitions, and has itself become a mere formula;* 2. it was intended to obviate all discord, and has become the shibboleth of many a separation.*—The three portions of the Lord's Prayer: The address—the petitions—the conclusion.—"*Our Father who art in heaven;*" or, the true inward posture of him who addresses God.—The Lord's Prayer viewed as an intercession.—The address, "*Our Father,*" so simple, and yet so novel: 1. infinitely easy, and yet infinitely difficult; 2. natural, yet supernatural; 3. humble, yet exalted; 4. the commencement and the conclusion of all prayer.—*Surrender* to God, as implying our *acceptance* of the kingdom of heaven: 1. The first three petitions express, that while surrendering ourselves to God, we own and seek His kingdom; 2. the last petitions, that while owning and seeking His kingdom, we surrender ourselves to Him.—The *name of God* constitutes the first object of our petitions; 1. From its glory; 2. from the dishonor which men cast upon it; 3. from its sanctification.—The name of God including and opening up the whole kingdom of heaven.—If you would have the name of God hallowed in the world, see that you first hallow it in your own hearts.—Learn to know the name of God; or, how readest thou? how seekest thou? how knowest thou? what believest thou? how stands it with thy learning and with thy teaching?—"*Thy kingdom come:*" 1. That the Old Testament, both in its law and in its types, may be fulfilled; 2. that the kingdom of darkness may be destroyed; 3. that the three-fold kingdom of grace, of power, and of glory may be manifested.—The petition, "Thy kingdom come," a missionary prayer.—A prayer for the final reconciliation of State and Church in the perfect kingdom of heaven.—Is both your ruling and your obeying in conformity with this fundamental principle?—"*Thy will be done,*" etc.: 1. Filialness of this petition: *Thy will;* 2. humility of this petition: *on earth;* 3. boldness of this petition: *as in heaven.*—Are your will and conduct regulated by this principle?—The three first petitions viewed, 1. as the promise descending from heaven to earth—Thy name in heaven, Thy kingdom between heaven and earth, Thy will on earth: 2. as a sacrifice ascending from earth to heaven—the surrender of our own name, of our own power, and of our own will.—As exhibiting, with increasing clearness and power, the union of heaven and earth: the revelation of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.—"*Give us this day our daily bread.*" Apparently one of the smallest, yet one of the greatest petitions. I. Smallness of the petition: 1. We ask what most men already possess; 2. we ask it only for the small circle of those around our table; 3. we ask only daily bread; 4. we ask it only for to-day. II. Greatness of the petition: 1. We ask that earthly bread should be converted into heavenly bread, or manna; 2. we ask that He would feed all those who are in want; 3. we ask that He would meet the daily requirements of a waiting world; 4. we ask it to-day, and ever again, to-day.—The fourth petition as a vow, 1. of sonship; 2. of trustfulness; 3. of labor; 4. of

* [Hence Luther somewhere calls the Lord's Prayer "the greatest martyr."—P. S.]

* [Dr. Lange alludes here more particularly to the difference between the German Lutherans, who pray: "*Vater unser,*" "*Father our*" (which is the ancient form and corresponds to the Latin *Pater noster*), and the German Reformed, who pray "*Unser Vater,*" "*Our Father,*" which is the modern German and was used by Luther himself in his German version of the Bible, Matt. vi. 9; Luke xi. 2. This difference, insignificant as it is, has often been exaggerated and been a cause of alienation of feeling and disturbance in devotion. So, also, the Lord's Supper, intended to be a sacred feast of love and union with Christ and His people, has innocently become the occasion of the most bitter theological strifes.—P. S.]

gratitude; 5. of kindness.—Prayer before meals in its wider sense: 1. A prayer of the husbandman; 2. a prayer for our ordinary calling; 3. a prayer for our daily work; 4. a prayer in our distress; 5. a prayer in all our earthly wants.—This grace before meat in its more restricted sense.—Moderation and contentment a fruit of trustfulness.—The prayer of contentment.—True contentment proceeding from a view of the hidden riches of God.—Hungering and thirsting after spiritual supplies will render us contented with our earthly supplies.—The prayer of penitence: "*Forgive us our debts:*" 1. It realizes sin, and realizes it as a debt; 2. it realizes the burden of sin as a debt resting on mankind generally; 3. it realizes forgiveness as a free grace and a free gift.—How true penitence appears in the prayer of faith.—Assurance of forgiveness calling forth the prayer, "Forgive us." —Forgiveness and readiness to forgive cannot be separated. Connection between the two: 1. Forgiveness makes us ready to forgive; 2. readiness to forgive inspires us with courage to seek forgiveness; 3. the spirit of forgiveness ever joins the two more closely together.—He who cannot forgive man, cannot find forgiveness with God: 1. Because he will not believe in forgiving love; 2. because he will not act upon its directions.—In what sense is it true that he who forgives shall be forgiven? 1. His forgiving is not the ground, but the evidence of his forgiveness; 2. his forgiving is an evidence that the forgiveness of God preserves him; 3. his forgiving shows the truth of his testimony, that there is forgiveness.—He who strictly reckons with his fellow-men in outward matters, cannot have experienced the gift of free grace in his inner life.—Forgiveness and readiness to surrender all are inseparably connected.—"*Lead us not into temptation.*"—How our trials by God may become temptations to sin: 1. By the supervention of our own evil inclinations; 2. of the world, with its allurements; 3. of the great tempter himself.—Every temptation is at the same time a judgment for the past and a danger for the future.—Even our necessary contact with a sinful world is a source of continual temptation.—God tempteth no man (James i. 13), yet may He lead us into temptation: 1. Because He *leads* us, and temptation is in the way; 2. because He tries us, and temptation supervenes; 3. because He deals with us according to our faith, and temptation exerts its power through our unbelief.—The dark cloud which rests upon our future: 1. Not want, but temptation; 2. not the enmity of the world, but its temptation; 3. not death, but again temptation.—Because we have, in our sinfulness, not trembled in anticipation of danger, we must, when pardoned, tremble after the danger is past.—A pardoned sinner has only *one* fear left, which leads to genuine fear of God, but delivers from all other dread: 1. The fear of defiling the white garment, of losing the ring, of being excluded from the marriage feast. 2. This leads to true fear of God: he recognizes God everywhere even in the midst of temptation; he hides in prayer under the shadow of the Almighty; his love casts out fear.—The courage and boldness of Christ's soldiers springs from their fear of temptation, just as in battle the courage which defies death springs from a calm view of the danger incurred.—Perfect love casteth out fear.—"*Deliver us from evil.*"—Along with the anticipation of the last assault, the believer will also obtain anticipation of final deliverance.—Deliverance in its threefold form:—at the commencement, in the middle, and at the end of our journey to heaven.—Deliver us from evil: 1. From sin here and hereafter; 2. from evil here and hereafter.—The last petition the commencement of triumph.—The intercession of the three [or four] last petitions.—Our confidence in prayer derived from the assurance that God is able and willing to help us.—The climax of our prayer is praise: "*Thine is the kingdom,*" etc.—The *kingdom* of God in its threefold form: the kingdom of nature, of grace, and of glory.—The threefold manifestation of the *power* of God: creation, redemption (the resurrection of Christ), and final judgment and glory.—Threefold manifestation of the *glory* of God: 1. The image of God glorified; 2. the Church of God glorified; 3. the city of God glorified (God all in all).—"*Amen,*" or calmness and assurance the fruit of prayer.—The Holy Spirit alone grants the true Amen, in prophetic anticipation of the answer in peace.—The "Amen" as combining the promise of God and the vow of man.—Christ our Yea and Amen.—How in this prayer Christ, 1. Hallows the name of God; 2. brings the kingdom of heaven; 3. reveals and fulfils upon earth the will of heaven; 4. appears as the manna from heaven; 5. introduces pardon and peace; 6. manifests Himself as the Shepherd and Guardian of His people; 7. as perfect Saviour and Deliverer; and hence as the Burden of the new song of the redeemed.—Prayer an outgoing of faith, through Christ, to God.—Prayer, or personal converse with God, is holy love.—The right relationship of Christians toward their neighbors, toward God, and toward themselves.—To give—to give oneself, and to surrender*—is, in a spiritual sense, to lend, to receive, and to enjoy.

Starke:—Jesus the Patron, the Advocate, and the Provider of the poor, John xxi. 5.—God loveth a cheerful giver, and His righteousness endureth for ever, 2 Cor. ix. 7, 9; Prov. xxii. 9.—It is proof of the folly of men, that they seek honor of each other, John xii. 43; and not rather that they may find acceptance with God, Ps. xxxi. 8.—Our best works become sin, if done only for the sake of appearance.—Our alms form part of our treasure; he who does not hide it, seems like one anxious to have it stolen, Mark xii. 42–44.—Pray without ceasing, 1 Thess. v. 17.—The prayer of the righteous availeth much, if it be earnest, Ps. cxlv. 18; James v. 16; but that of the hypocrite availeth nothing, Luke xviii. 10, 14.—We may everywhere find a place for prayer, 1 Tim. ii. 8; Jonah ii. 2, 3; but the prayer of the hypocrite is a lie wherever it be offered, Ps. l. 16, 17.—Sinful intentions in the heart may destroy the most holy outward acts, Luke xviii. 10, 14.—Prayer presupposes solitude, at least of the heart,—the most secret place in the house of God which is within, where we should close the door behind us, even though it be in public prayer, or in the largest assembly, 2 Kings iv. 4; Ps. lxxvii. 3.—*Quesnel:* Prayer requires heart rather than tongue, sighing rather than words, faith rather than reason, Mark xi. 23.—*Würtemberg Bible:* Those brief ejaculatory prayers† sent up to heaven in few words, and which may be uttered even while engaged in our daily labor, are by far the richest and best, ch. xv. 25.—*Quesnel:* Prayer is not intended to inform God, but to set before man his misery, to humble his heart, to awaken his desires, to kindle his faith, to encourage his hope, to raise his soul toward heaven, and to remind him that his Father, his home, and his eternal inheritance are above, Phil. iii. 20.

* [In German: *Geben, Hingeben, Aufgeben.*—]
† [Called by Luther: *Kurze Stossgebetlein.*—]

The Lord's Prayer.—*Quesnel:*—A king who himself draws up the petition which is to be presented, must surely take great pleasure in granting it, Isa. lxv. 24; John xvi. 23.—It is not wrong for an unlettered Christian to make use of a form of prayer; but it is well to accustom ourselves to bring our wants before God in our own words.—Our heavenly Father alone is to be worshipped, and no creature, ch. iv. 10.—*Maj. Harm.:* The kingdom of God comes from heaven to earth, in order that earth may become heaven. None of us can ascend from earth to heaven, unless the kingdom of God have first descended on us from heaven to earth, Luke vii. 20, 21.—Poor sinful man!—we are, so to speak, afflicted with spiritual impotence, so that we cannot come to the kingdom of God, but the kingdom of God must come to us, John vi. 44.—The will of God cannot be done unless we are willing, so much as lieth in us, to deny the will of our flesh, of Satan, and of an evil world, Rom. xii. 21.—Our daily bread comes from God, and not by blind fortune, or by fate, Hosea ii. 8.—Let us be satisfied with what is absolutely necessary, and not ask God for more than that, 1 Tim. vi. 8; Prov. xxx. 8.—The ungodly receive their bread by the intercession of the saints, Gen. xli. 54. —The poor equally pray for the rich, and the rich for the poor.—If we are not ready to forgive, we only pray against ourselves, or invoke wrath and vengeance, which God will execute upon us, even as we reserve vengeance against our neighbor, Sirach xxviii. 14.—The life of the Christian a continual conflict.—*Maj. Harm.:* Our comfort under all temptations is this, that God is with us, that He sets bounds, and will make all things work together for our salvation, 1 Cor. x. 13; 2 Tim. iv. 17.—We endure under temptation, not in our own strength, but in that of God, 1 Cor. x. 13; 2 Pet. ii. 9; Isa. xli. 10–14.—*Quesnel:* Ah! how many snares are there, how many hindrances to what is good, how many occasions to sin, how many enemies of salvation, how much sorrow and misery! Ps. cvi.—Thou who temptest others to sin, who exposest thyself wantonly to temptation, or who in temptation fightest yet not with the armor of God, why wilt thou mock God by praying, "Lead us not into temptation?" 1 Pet. v. 6; Eph. vi. 11.—Canst thou be afraid of death, and yet pray, "Deliver us from evil?"—He has already delivered us from evil, He does deliver us, and He will perfectly deliver us, 2 Tim. iv. 18; 2 Cor. i. 10.—The honor of God should be the first and the last object of our prayers (Thy name, etc.; for Thine is, etc.), Ps. lxix. 31, cxv. 1.—Spiritual fasting consists in ceasing from evil, Isa. lviii. 6, 7; and in temperance in all things, Luke xxi. 34.—The popish fasts are a constraint of conscience, a mockery, a hypocrisy, and a superstition, 1 Tim. iv. 3.—The more a sinner seeks to attract the attention of men, the further does God turn His compassion from him, Acts xii. 21, 23.—In order to be a sincere Christian, it is not necessary to hang our head like a bulrush, Isa. lviii. 5.—The life of believers is hid with Christ in God; but when Christ, who is their life, shall appear, they also shall appear with Him in glory, Col. iii. 3, 4; 2 Cor. vi. 9, 10.—Our good works, though done in secret, are not lost.

Lisco:—True righteousness: It consists not in appearance, but in reality and truth; its objects are not earthly, but heavenly; it has respect to the judgment of God, not to that of man. "Reference" to God the sole motive of truly good works.

Gerlach:—A comparison of this passage with ch. v. 16 shows that in this instance also our Lord teaches by contrasts. He unmasks selfishness in all its forms, both when it conceals unbelief under the garb of humility and retirement, and when it exhibits its fancied treasures to the view of men. It may be equally wrong in the sight of God to hide our good works (ver. 4) as to display them.—If you would have your most ardent desire accomplished, pray, "Thy will be done."—The object of fasting is to set us free from the power of the flesh and of the world; but if we employ it to further our worldly views, it will only serve to increase the gulf between God and our souls.

Braune:—The address, *Father*, is also found Isa. lxiii. 16: "Thou, O Lord, art our Father, our Redeemer." This was a temporary anticipation of the higher life of the Spirit of Christ in the prophet (1 Pet. i. 11). The name, *Father*, awakens in us the sense of our relationship to God, the feeling of filial love and trust. We have received the spirit of adoption, Rom. viii. 15; Gal. iv. 6.

Heubner:—*Chrysostom:* If you have not heard your own prayers, how can you expect that God shall hear them?—The will of God is in the first place His will with reference to us, which we are to do. The petition therefore means: Take away our own will, and let Thy will be my rule. But, further, the will of God also implies His purposes concerning us. Hence the petition means: Give us such a mind as to be satisfied with whatever Thou sendest, and never to murmur.—A Christian must learn also to have dominion over his body.

Literature.—Fr. Arndt [of Berlin]: *Zehn Predigten über das Gebet des Herrn*, 1836; Niemann: *Zehn Predigten über das Vater Unser*, 1844.—[Also Tertullian: *De oratione* (who calls the Lord's Prayer: *Breviarium evangelii*); Cyprian: *De oratione Dominica;* Augustine: *De serm. M.* ii. 4–8; *Serm.* 56–58; Origen: Περὶ εὐχῆς; Gregory of Nyssa: *De oratione Dominica;* Cyril of Jerusalem: *Catech.* xxiii.; Bp. Andrewes (Anglican, who calls the Lord's Prayer "a compendium of faith"): *Works*, Oxf., 1841 sqq., vol. v., 350–476); the explanations of this Prayer in the leading Catechisms of Luther, Calvin, Heidelberg, Westminster, of Trent, etc.; Löhe (Germ. Luth.): *Sermons on the Lord's Prayer;* Wm. R. Williams (Baptist): *Lectures on the Lord's Prayer*, New York, 1850.—P. S.]

4. *Spurious worldliness of the Pharisees in their righteousness; or, the Pharisees' sharing of the cares of the heathen.*

Chapter VI. 19–34.

(*Vers.* 24–34 *the Pericope for the* 15*th Sunday after Trinity.*)

19 Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt
20 [consume], and where thieves break through and steal: But lay up for yourselves
treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt [consumeth], and where
21 thieves do not break through nor steal: For where your[1] treasure is, there will your
22 heart be also. The light of the body is the eye: if therefore thine eye be single, thy
23 whole body shall be full of light. But if thine eye be evil, thy whole body shall be
full of darkness. If therefore the light that is in thee be darkness, how great *is* that
24 darkness! No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love
the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God
25 and mammon. Therefore I say unto you, Take no [anxious] thought for your life,
what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink;[2] nor yet for your body, what ye shall put
26 on. Is not the life more than meat, and the body than raiment? Behold the fowls of
the air: for they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns; yet your heav-
27 enly Father feedeth them. Are ye not much better than they? Which of you
28 by taking thought can add one cubit unto his stature [age]? And why take ye
thought for raiment? Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they toil not,
29 neither do they spin: And yet I say unto you, That even Solomon in all his glory was
30 not arrayed like one of these. Wherefore, if God so clothe the grass of the field, which
to-day is, and to-morrow is cast into the oven, *shall he* not much more *clothe* you, O
31 ye of little faith? Therefore take no thought, saying, What shall we eat? or, What
32 shall we drink? or, Wherewithal shall we be clothed? (For after all these things do
the Gentiles seek:) for your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these
33 things. But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness;[3] and all these
34 things shall be added unto [to] you. Take therefore no thought for the morrow: for the
morrow shall take thought for the things of itself. Sufficient unto the day *is* the evil
thereof.

[1] Ver. 21.—*Recepta:* ὑμῶν. [Lachmann, Tischendorf, Fritzsche, Meyer, and Alford give the preference to σου, *thy* treasure.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 25.—Lachmann ἤ, following Cod. B., etc., ἢ τί πίητε. The addition is omitted by the younger authorities and Tischendorf.

[3] Ver. 33.—[Cod. B.: τ. δικαιοσύνην κ. τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Connection.—Considerable importance attaches to the question as to the connection between this and the preceding section. According to Strauss and others, the two are wholly unconnected. De Wette remarks: "Hitherto the discourse proceeded upon a definite plan; but now the connection seems loose, and longer and shorter sayings follow each other." Even Neander regards the verses under consideration as an interpolation of Matthew. Meyer misses only the connecting link with the preceding section, but maintains, against de Wette, the connection of what follows, without, however, tracing it out. [He adds, p. 154, that we must not confound the unity of the Sermon on the Mount with the unity of a modern sermon.—P. S.] Tholuck maintains, that while in all probability this section belongs to the context as given in Luke xii. 22–34, it is impossible to deny that its position in the Gospel by Matthew is the correct one. "The transition was natural from the idea that good works should be done only with reference to Him who is invisible, to the conclusion expressed in ver. 33, that in all our aims and undertakings the mind should be set upon the things of eternity." In our opinion (as expressed previously in the *Leben Jesu*, ii. 2, 619), the *internal* connection between the two sections appears from Matt. xxiii. 14: "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye devour widows' houses, and for a pretence make long prayer." *The false spirituality* of these hypocrites arose from the *worldly-mindedness* with which they are specially charged in the text. The *external* connection with the previous section lies in the relation between the μὴ θησαυρίζετε, and the ἀπέχουσιν τὸν μισθὸν αὐτῶν of vers. 2, 5, 16. Having shown how the Pharisees by their false spirituality sought to lay up for themselves treasures in a figurative sense, the Lord next exhibits their hypocrisy and worldliness in seeking to gather treasures in the literal sense. Thus far Tholuck is right in saying that the admonition to lay up for themselves treasures in heaven is closely connected with what

was formerly said about doing good works in secret, which the Father would reward openly. But that our Lord refers to worldly-mindedness in the garb of hypocrisy, and not to ordinary worldly-mindedness, appears from the expression, "Ye cannot serve God and mammon;" and, again, from that most important declaration, "If therefore the light that is in thee be darkness," etc. The history of the Middle Ages, of monasticism, and of the hierarchy, has amply proved that false spirituality is closely connected with worldly-mindedness, long prayers with covetousness and ambition, almsgiving with avarice, and fasting with feasting. Indeed, this love of the world, while apparently fleeing from it, is the characteristic feature of monasticism.

Ver. 19. **Θησαυρούς, treasures.**—Treasures of any kind, but more closely defined by the addition of the term **upon earth,** and by the possibility of their being corrupted by moth and rust, or carried away by thieves. The moth attaches itself principally to garments which are not used, especially to precious robes of office.—**Consumption,** βρῶσις (the Vulgate and our authorized version render it *rust*, James v. 2, 3; Kuinoel and Baumgarten-Crusius refer it to a species of worms; Casaubonus and others speak of a ἓν διὰ δυοῖν, hence σὴς βρώσκουσα); a general expression, but points primarily to provisions, to accumulations of food and corn; while the breaking through of thieves refers to the possession of gold and silver. The meaning seems to be, that everything which is passing away has its own principle of destruction, suited to its special nature, whether vegetable, animal, or moral. In general, it exhibits the vanity of all earthly possessions, and the unsatisfactory character of the enjoyments which they yield. Irrespective of their use, these possessions are dead, exposed to the moth, to consumption, and to thieves,—to the organs of physical and moral annihilation. It scarcely requires to be added, that the *place* of these treasures, the *kind* of treasures, and the *manner* in which they are collected, are in this instance equally of the earth, earthy.

Ver. 20. **Treasures in heaven.**—Our attention is first directed to the *place* where genuine treasures are to be found, viz., heaven, where God reveals Himself, and where all is eternal. The *kind* of treasures is in accordance with their *place*, or with heaven. Similarly, these treasures must be gathered in a heavenly *manner*—by kindness, by spiritual fellowship with God, by self-denial; in short, by a surrender to our Father who is in heaven. It is therefore quite erroneous (with Chrysostom and others) to apply it to almsgiving, in the expectation of a heavenly reward. On the other hand, it may be necessary to remind those who, like Meyer, seem to regard the kingdom of heaven as something external and future, that this heavenly life begins upon earth by faith.—The heavenly possessions are characterized according to their negative advantages, where no moth doth corrupt, etc.; comp. 1 Pet. i. 4.—These words are also directed against the carnal anticipations of the Jews, especially of the Pharisees and scribes.

Ver. 21. **For where your treasure is.**—Our treasure, or dearest possession, forms the ideal on which our affections are set, and in accordance with which our feelings and desires assume shape. Hence, if our treasure is on earth, our heart will also be there, our inclinations and desires will be earthly; and, since this is contrary to our heavenly destiny, the consequence must be eternal sorrow and shame. But if the heart has its treasure in heaven, its affections will also be directed thither, and it will be transformed in accordance therewith.

Ver. 22. **The light of the body.**—Connection. Not: in order to fulfil this duty, you must "preserve your inner light or reason (Chrysostom: ὁ νοῦς) undimmed;" but: ye must preserve your mental eye undivided in its gaze. The Lord evidently alludes here to the Pharisees, whose attention and affections were divided between what was temporal and what was spiritual. Their state of mind is illustrated by the eye. The eye is the light of the body (lit from the light of the sun). Everything now depends on a right condition of the eye. It must be ἁπλοῦς, *i.e.*, *simple*, in opposition to the πονηρός, or *bad*, *spoiled* eye. If the contrast between a healthy and a diseased eye were intended (in the sense of any ailment affecting it), it would have been otherwise expressed. We conclude, therefore, that it refers to the contrast between proper sight and deceptive or double sight. "The word is never used to indicate *healthy*. Hence we might agree with Elsner and Olshausen in explaining it as *an eye which does not see double*—double sight being a disease; and, with Quesnel, apply it as meaning, that it knows only one object of love—even God. But if we inquire what Hebrew word corresponded to the Greek term, we find that Aquila and the Sept. translate ἁπλοῦς for the Hebrew תָּם, יָשָׁר = ὁλόκληρος, which latter, like *integer*, is related to ἁπλοῦς. Thus Theophylact explains ἁπλοῦς and πονηρός by ὑγιής and νοσώδης." Tholuck.—But we object to any translation of definite and distinct into more general terms, in order thus to give them a meaning which is not warranted by the context. The desire of serving at the same time God and mammon may be characterised as a moral double sight, as an evil eye, which is rightly designated by πονηρός, in direct contrast to ἁπλοῦς. But the eye is ἁπλοῦς, when it wholly, consciously, and calmly agrees with the state of the mind and heart,—when it is not wandering, and therefore not double-sighted nor untrue, and hence worse than blind. On the other hand, the eye is evil if it lose its power of perceiving, or begins to wander and miss the object set before it. Then the whole body will be full of darkness, or enveloped in night. But the darkening of the mind has more sad consequences than that of the body. *If therefore*—a *conclusio a minori ad majus*—*the light that is in thee* (the inward light) be darkness, etc.

Ver. 23. The question as to the meaning of **the light that is in thee,** is of importance. Chrysostom: ὁ νοῦς. Calvin: *Lumen vocat Christus rationem, quantulacunque hominibus reliqua manet post lapsum Adæ.* Beza, Chemnitz, Gerhard, Calov: "The eye which is enlightened by the word and Spirit of God."—Tholuck: That which is left of the Divine image in man, after John viii. 47; xviii. 37; or, as Gerhard has it, *lumen naturæ*, the light of nature.—Meyer: Reason, especially practical reason.—The capacity of the inner eye of reason to become the organ of knowledge is evidently here alluded to, although the expression has a more special meaning. It is not the inner eye itself, the νοῦς, but the light of the inner eye, or the Old Testament revelation so well known by the Pharisees and scribes, which had, by their carnal views, been perverted into error.—If the bodily eye is blind, the danger is less, because precaution will be used. The real peril lies in the eye seeing falsely or double, because in that case the light of the sun will only serve to blind, which is

worse than utter darkness. The same holds true of the inner eye when it converts the light of revelation into a blinding and misleading light. This was the case with the Pharisees and scribes. They would have had God and a carnal Messiah,—they would serve the Lord and mammon.

As the organ of light, the eye of the body is, so to speak, our light; occupying, so far as we are concerned, the place of the sun, and in that respect representing the whole body, as if the whole body were an eye. This makes it also the organ and symbol of the inner eye, or of reason, by which the light of the spiritual sun is communicated to the inner life, and which, if healthy, converts the whole inner life into a capacity of spiritual perception. But just as when the external eye is not simple or double in its sight, the outward light only serves to dazzle, so also in reference to the inner eye and the light of revelation. **How great is that darkness!** The history of pharisaical Judaism has amply corroborated the truth of this statement.

The inward eye is intended to be the eye of the heart. Eph. i. 18. The state of the heart and the state of the eye influence each other. If the heart is set on heavenly treasures, the eye must be directed toward the light. Comp. the biblical psychology of Beck, and Delitzsch.

Ver. 24. **No man can serve two masters.**—Double sight of the spiritual eye is both the cause and the consequence of duplicity in reference to the desires of the heart (James i. 8, ἀνὴρ δίψυχος). But the Pharisees, in their false spirituality, reduced it to a system, and deemed themselves capable of combining the service of Heaven with their earthly inclinations. The Lord dispels in the text this delusion. It is plain that no man can at the same time truly serve two masters. One of the two services must necessarily be merely outward, or, what is worse, one of the masters must be hated or despised,—because true service presupposes love and attachment. But why two examples? Meyer: "He will either hate the one and love the other, or else hold to the one and despise the other." This commentator correctly reminds us that, as in other places, so here, μισεῖν and ἀγαπᾶν must have their full meaning, and not be interpreted by *posthabere* and *præferre*, as de Wette and others propose. But then there must have been some special object for giving two instances. Perhaps the difference between them may lie in this, that the real master cannot be despised, but may be *hated*, since he must be respected, and it is impossible to get away from him. But if the real master is loved, the servant will hold to him and despise the usurper, who has no real claim, and from whose power it is possible and easy to withdraw. The application of this to spiritual life is plain. Man can have only one master, or only one highest good and principle of life. But if he choose the world as his highest good, and, along with the worship of the true God, attempt the service of an idol, he must decide for himself. First, however, let him clearly understand that he cannot at the same time serve two masters, and that, in attempting this double service, he can only be a traitor and a hypocrite.

And Mammon.—Probably mammon was originally not the name of a mythological deity, but was gradually imported into mythology from common life, in a manner similar to that in which the term is still employed. Bretschneider: "Μαμωνᾶς, *Hebr.* מָמוֹן, *fortasse significat id, cui confiditur, ut Sept.* אֱמוּנָה, *Isa. xxxiii.* 6, θησαυρούς, *Ps. xxxvii.* 3, πλοῦτον, *reddiderunt, vel est, ut multi putant, nomen Idoli Syrorum et Pœnorum, i. q. Plutos Græcorum.*" Augustine remarks on this passage: "*Congruit et punicum nomen, nam lucrum punice Mammon dicitur.*" "Money, in opposition to God, is personified and regarded as an idol, somewhat like Plutus, although it cannot be shown that such an idol was worshipped."—Olshausen.

Luther: To have money and property is not sinful, provided it become not thy *master*, but remain thy servant and thou its master.*

Ver. 25. **Take no thought.**†—Connection. Anxiety, which is distrust of God, is the source of avarice. Accordingly, the following sins follow each other in regular genealogy: 1. Anxious care, distrust of God, commencement of apostasy; 2. avarice, and service of mammon, along with spurious and merely external service of God; 3. hypocrisy, and further development of external service into religious parade before men.—Again, anxious care itself springs from evil inclination and vanity, from worldliness (*What shall we eat*, etc.?),—which marks the beginning of apostasy from God. The word μεριμνᾶν, *to take thought*, denotes not merely "*anxious* care" (de Wette), which would be a tautology, but inordinate or solicitous concern or grief beyond our immediate wants, calling, or daily occupation; hence it is in reality to weaken one's hands in prospect of the work before us, or *the direct opposite of carefulness.* From its nature, care extends εἰς τὴν αὔριον, ver. 34.—By its solicitude the heart becomes divided, which is hinted in the word μεριμνᾶν (Tholuck).—Τῇ ψυχῇ, in reference to the soul as the principle of physical life.—Is not the *life* more?—He who has given the greater will also give the less.—Solicitude is entirely at fault; Christ teaches us to reason,—God gave me life, which is the greater; therefore also, etc.

Ver. 26. **The fowls of the air** [literally: **the sky** or **heaven**].—עוֹף הַשָּׁמַיִם, which fly along the heavens,—*i. e.*, appear separated from earth and its provisions, and yet fly so cheerily; like the *lily*,

* [The same idea is expressed by St. Jerome *in loc.:* "Non dixit (Dominus), qui *habet* divitias, sed qui *servit* divitiis; qui divitiarum servus est *custodit* ut *servus;* qui servitutis excussit jugum, *distribuit* eas ut *dominus.*"—P. S.]

† [Μὴ μεριμνᾶτε: *Take not thought, be not concerned about, care not for, be not solicitous, be not distracted* (from μερίζω). English interpreters generally take the word *thought* of the Com. E. Vers. in the old English sense for solicitude, *anxious* care (Bacon and Shakspeare; *e. g.*, "Queen Catharine Parr died *of thought*"). Hence Campbell and others translate: "*Be not anxious,*" laying the stress wholly on the *excess* of care or solicitude. Jos. Addis. Alexander, *ad Matt.* vi. 25: "The idea of excess is here essential, so that ordinary thought or care is not excluded." Alford: "The E. V., '*Take no thought,*' does not express the sense, but gives rather an exaggeration of the command, and thus makes it unreal and nugatory. In Luke xii. 29 we have μὴ μετεωρίζεσθε." But the prohibition has reference rather to the *future* (comp. ver. 34: "Take no thought *for the morrow*"), and to all that exceeds our *actual wants*, as expressed in the petition: "Give us *this day* our *daily* bread." Meyer says: "Care is here generally understood emphatically of *anxious* care (which the word does not mean even in Sir. xxxiv. 1), but this is an arbitrary assumption. Jesus prohibits to his disciples *all* concern about eating, drinking, etc. (das Besorgtsein *überhaupt*)." Yet some limitation is obviously suggested by ver. 34, as already remarked, and required by the nature of the case as well as the consistency of Scripture teaching, which plainly enjoins forethought and proper care in temporal things, and condemns only that care which springs from unbelieving doubt and distrust in Providence; comp. 1 Tim. v. 8; 2 Thess. iii. 10; John xii. 6; xiii. 29.—P. S.]

ישְׁמוֹן, which in its splendid apparel stands in the midst of a desolate and dusty plain.

Ver. 27. **Age** [Com. Version: **Stature**], ἡλικία.—There are two interpretations of this term: First, *stature* of the body; Vulgate, Chrysostom, Luther [our authorized version, also Fritzsche, Conant]. Secondly, *duration of life, age;* Hammond, Wolf, Olshausen, Ewald, Meyer [de Wette, Tholuck, Stier, Alford, J. A. Alexander, Dav. Brown]. Both translations are warranted by the use of the language, but the context is decidedly in favor of "duration of life." For, 1. our Lord refers to the preservation or the prolonging of life; 2. the adding of a cubit to the stature were not something very inconsiderable, as is implied in the text.*—**A cubit** (2 spans), a figurative expression, denoting that the duration of life has its fixed measure. Similarly also the provision for our life is fixed.

Ver. 28. **Consider the lilies,** καταμάθετε τὰ κρίνα.—Very significant, as much as: *learn to understand, study* the symbolical language of the lilies.

Ver. 29. **In all his glory,** δόξα, which may either mean his royal pomp, or the pomp of his royal army. The word περιεβάλετο, which follows, is in favor of the first of these explanations. Solomon was to the Jewish mind the highest representative of human glory (2 Chron. ix. 15).

Ver. 30. **The grass of the field,** or every kind of herb,—among them the lilies, which adorn and are cut down with them. Dried grass and the stalks of flowers were used for heating ovens. "A number of beautiful flowers grow wild on the fields and meadows of the Promised Land,—among them the splendid purple or bright yellow lily, of which the stem is three feet high, and of a dark red color, the flower forming a crown which is surmounted by a tuft of leaves. Song iv. 5; vi. 2; 1 Kings vii. 19. In Palestine, the grass withers in the course of two days under a strong east wind; when it is only fit for hay or fuel." Gerlach. (Comp. Heubner, p. 90, on extravagance in dress and avarice.)

Ver. 32. **After all these things do the Gentiles seek.**—Such is the essential feature of heathenism; and this worldliness led to their apostasy, polytheism, and idolatry. It deserves notice, that Christ here refers for the third time to the Gentiles, since the Pharisees made it their special boast that they were free from all heathen contamination. But the very extreme of their traditionalism led them into heathen views and practices.

Ver. 33. **Seek ye first.**—Meyer: "Πρῶτον, *first*, before ye seek anything else; your *first* seeking. There is no room then for any other seeking, as their eating, drinking, etc., προστεθήσεται. Not seeing this inference, a few authorities have omitted the word πρῶτον, as in Luke xii. 31. De Wette is mistaken in supposing that πρῶτον at least 'indirectly' implies the lawfulness of subordinately seeking other things. All other seeking, whether the πρῶτον be retained or not, is excluded by ver. 32 (πάντα γ. ταῦτα τὰ ἔθνη ἐπιζητ.) and by καὶ—προστεθήσεται."—But in this case the word πρῶτον must mean not merely first in order of time, but refers to the principle which actuates us in *seeking*, on which our earnestness in our temporal calling, and the blessing upon that calling, depend. This principle of ever setting before us, even in temporal matters, the grand spiritual object, leads onward and upward, until that which is secondary and subordinate is wholly swallowed up in that which is spiritual.—The difference between the simple ζητεῖτε and its compound ἐπιζητοῦσιν deserves mention. The former refers to a seeking which in itself is healthy; the other, to that which is unhealthy and excessive.

The kingdom of God, and His righteousness.—The kingdom of heaven is here called that of God, because the former verses refer to God as the highest good. To seek the kingdom of God, is to seek those blessings which are expressed in the Lord's Prayer, and of which the corresponding righteousness is delineated in the Sermon on the Mount.

Ver. 34. **The morrow,** ἡ αὔριον, is personified. Every day brings its own **evil**—κακία, ταλαιπωρία, κακότης—from an evil world, but also its own help and deliverance from our heavenly Father.*

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The real nature of false spirituality appears in the dualism to which it leads, in the attempt violently to sever between God and the world; and in the false worldliness which it cherishes, in order to make up for this deficiency. Hence, *fanum* and *profanum*—holiday and work-day; priest and layman; cloister and the world; spiritual and temporal care; spiritual and temporal power (the two swords, as they are called); spiritual and temporal gain; spiritual and temporal possessions; spiritual and temporal enjoyment (Carnival and Lent). Or rather, more correctly, it is not spiritual and temporal, but temporal and spiritual.

True Christianity, on the other hand, combines spiritual with temporal life, by viewing the world itself as the symbol of God, and by sanctifying everything in it for the service of the Holy One.

2. Moths, consumption, and thieves corrupt the possessions and the enjoyments of the world, if we regard the world as our lasting habitation. See in this respect the whole Book of Ecclesiastes, or the Preaching of Solomon.

3. Science, natural philosophy, and even the highest poetry, have only recognized at a comparatively late period the sun-like nature of the eye, while here it is painted as with a sunbeam. To each of us, the eye is his sun, provided it be calm and single. Thus

* [The only objection to the version *age*, is that *cubit* is a measure of space, and not of time. But this objection is easily removed if we remember the frequent representation of human life as a *journey*, and the familiar phrase: *length* of life, "Lebens*länge*." Comp. Ps. xxxix. 5; 2 Tim. iv. 7, etc. MEYER: "*Die von Gott geordnete Lebensdauer wird im Bilde eines bestimmten Längenmaasses gedacht.*" The primary meaning of ἡλικία is *age* and corresponds better with the parallel passage, Luke xii. 26: "If ye then be not able to do that *which is least*, why take ye thought for the rest?" For to add a *cubit, i. e.*, eighteen inches or a foot and a half, to man's *stature* would be doing something very great.—P. S.]

* [DR. DAV. BROWN, *in loc.*: "*Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof.* An admirable practical maxim, and better rendered in our version than in almost any other, not excepting the preceding English ones. Every day brings its own cares; and to anticipate is only to double them." DR. WORDSWORTH, *in loc.*: "This adage is found in the Talmud Berachot, fol. 9, 2. Vorst, *De Adag. N. T.*, p. 806. Here it may be observed, that our Lord adopts and spiritualizes several proverbial sayings in succession, which were known to the Jews. In the same manner as in the Lord's Prayer He adopted and spiritualized petitions from the Jewish Liturgy. He thus exemplified His own precept concerning new wine and new bottles (Matt. ix. 16, 17), and on bringing out of the storehouse things new and old (xiii. 52). In all those cases He animates the old letter with the new Spirit of His own."—P. S.]

our vision depends on two conditions,—the outward sun in the heavens, and the inward sun of the mind. And thus the outward eye is at the same time a symbol and a medium of the inward eye, or of intelligence, the νοῦς. Our intelligence serves as the organ of the sun of revelation, and becomes light, if it reflect not merely our own finite understanding, but our higher reason, and transmit divine revelation to the inmost soul. Otherwise the light itself becomes darkness. And such night is the most dense,—more so than ordinary night, which is only *black*, implying the absence of light, or *ignorance*. Less guilt attaches itself to this than to the *grey* of mist—the interruption of light by folly or prejudice. But worst of all is that splendor of false light, when the light of revelation is perverted by the worldly mind into error, and truth itself converted into a lie.

4. Christ unmasks the worldliness which hides under the garb of false spirituality, and traces it to its ultimate source: hypocrisy, avarice, solicitude, and worldly lust. He next invokes, against this spirit of solicitude in its spiritual garb, the testimony of the Spirit of God in nature, which the Pharisees, in their ultra-piety, had overlooked. Throughout, nature discloses its symbols to the Lord; and they all serve as symbols for the faithfulness of God and the trustfulness of man.

5. Christ Himself first sought the kingdom of God and His righteousness, in the fullest and most perfect sense; and everything else has been added to Him, Isa. liii. So shall it also be with His people (Rom. viii.).

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

How false spirituality always has its root in worldliness: 1. Its source is secretly cherished worldliness; 2. it is essentially a manifestation of the carnal mind, and hence worldliness (Col. ii. 18); 3. it seeks in vain to conceal the worldliness which it everywhere betrays. Or, 1. Proof from the nature of the thing; 2. from history; 3. from experience of the twofold temptations with which every Christian is familiar.—Temporal possessions: 1. What they are in themselves; 2. what they become by faith; 3. what they become to the carnal mind.—"*Treasures upon earth.*" A contradiction, when viewed in connection with our never-dying souls: 1. As being outward treasures; 2. as being transient; 3. as liable to loss.—Treasures upon earth,—so unsubstantial, and yet so dangerous: 1. Because they are spoiled by moths, consumption, and thieves; 2. because they bring moths, consumption, and thieves into the heart. —The worm of death in its threefold ravages: 1. In inanimate nature; 2. in physical life; 3. in human society, or in the moral world.—A thief, or a deceiver, the moth and consumption of the moral order of things.—*The treasures in heaven.*—The treasures in heaven, in their unchangeable character: 1. They cannot be corrupted from within; 2. they cannot be consumed from without; 3. they cannot be taken away from beneath.—The treasures of earth and the treasures of heaven.—Gathering in appearance and gathering in reality.—False gathering is a casting away, under the appearance of gain.—Real gathering is gain, under the appearance of loss.—True and false gain.—Wondrous character of the possessions of heaven: 1. They are hidden, yet manifest; 2. infinitely far, yet infinitely near; 3. one treasure, yet innumerable treasures.—Only in connection with heaven can we again acquire earth as God's earth.—"*Where your treasure is, there will your heart be also.*" 1. The truth of this saying (the heart ever lives in its highest good). 2. Inferences from this saying: (*a*) As the treasure is, such shall the heart become: the heart will become heavenly or earthly, according as its treasure is; (*b*) strictly speaking, our heart cannot become earthly,—it rather becomes devilish, a prey to the passions of hell; (*c*) our heart is of heavenly origin, and cannot find rest or satisfaction in earthly possessions.—"*The eye is the light of the body:*" 1. The truth; 2. the symbol.—The body in its relation to the mind: 1. It is an instrument of the mind, by which man is to serve and glorify God; 2. a symbol of the mind, by which God admonishes man.—The eye and the light, in their physical and spiritual import: 1. The eye is also of the light, and shares the nature of light; 2. the eye itself becomes light by receiving light; 3. the eye gives light to the whole body.—The eye and the sun: 1. The eye is sun-like; 2. the sun is the eye of heaven; 3. the eye and the sun combined give light to the body.—A single eye and an evil eye, in their respective bearing on the inner life: 1. The eye, if single, has an undivided, and hence true vision; it beholds what is right, because it rightly beholds. 2. The eye that is evil is an *ignis fatuus:* its vision is divided, and hence false; it beholds what is false, because it falsely beholds.—The difference between a diseased eye and an evil eye, or him who is really blind and him who is blinded.—Not the blind, but the blinded, fall: for, 1. in their carelessness, they do not see; 2. in their excitement, they do not behold the principal object; 3. in their confusion, they see everything in a dim and disordered manner.—The inward eye and its object: 1. Its nature: to perceive that which is eternal. 2. Its light: the revelation of God in its widest sense. 3. Its giving of light: truthful application of the light which it has received.—An evil eye in our hearts, or perverted reason, may turn even the light of revelation into darkness.—The most dense darkness is that which the hypocrite makes to himself from the light of revelation.—The threefold night: 1. The blackness of night: want of light, ignorance. 2. The grey of mist: obstruction of light, prejudice. 3. The blinding light,* or abuse and perversion of light, superstition and hypocrisy.—An evil heart changing the inward light into darkness: 1. By its spiritual pride; 2. by its carnal security; 3. by its treating the flesh as if it were spirit, and perverting the spirit into flesh.—"*How great is that darkness!*" 1. When the inner eye is not only blind, but blinded; 2. when the inner light is not only obscured, but misleads; 3. when the day of salvation is changed into the night of destruction.—"*No man can serve two masters:*" 1. The truth of this statement; 2. its import and weight.—Earthly possessions as mammon.—Mammon the greatest of all idols: 1. The idol of all times; 2. the idol of all nations; 3. the idol of all unconverted hearts; 4. the origin of all idolatry; 5. the first and the last among all the hidden idols of God's people, both under the Old and the New Testament.—The service of mammon converts the service of God into a lie.—True service of God excludes the service of mammon.—It is impossible to disown the service of our Lord and Master, by serving Him unfaithfully: we may hate, but we cannot cast off His authority.—If we despise him

* [Dr. Lange calls the three nights: *black* night, *gray* night, and *white* night, or *Lichtmangel, Lichthemmung Lichtzerstörung.*—P. S.]

claims mastery over us, we shall soon m his service.—Solicitude is the mother —Anxious care the certain consequence of worldly lust.—"*Take no* [serious or anxious] *thought:*" 1. Neither for your life (your maintenance); 2. nor for your body (your attire); 3. nor for what may befall you (for to-morrow).—Spiritual reasoning calculated to extinguish our solicitude. 1. God has already given us the greatest and best gift: (*a*) The life of the body is more than its nourishment; (*b*) the life of the mind is more noble than that of its instrument, the body; (*c*) the life of life, or the divine life, is the highest gain. 2. God will also give us all other things in addition: nourishment for the body; preservation of the body, and spiritual sustenance for the life which is from Him.—The birds of the air and the lilies of the field, preachers of trustfulness.—The difference between solicitude and lawful providence.—What solicitude cannot achieve and what it can achieve: 1. What it cannot achieve: (*a*) It cannot pray; (*b*) it cannot work; (*c*) it cannot create anything; (*d*) it cannot alter anything. 2. What it can achieve: (*a*) Conceal heaven from our view; (*b*) spoil earth; (*c*) open hell.—Solicitude the main principle of heathenism. It springs, 1. from the ignorance of the heathen, who know not the living God; 2. from their deifying the things of the world.—"*Your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things.*"—God will not only nourish, but also adorn us.—How strange, if the little bird were to attempt sewing, or the lily spinning?—What solicitude loses, and what it gains: 1. It loses, (*a*) the present moment; (*b*) to-day; (*c*) all eternity. 2. It gains, (*a*) foolish projects; (*b*) anxious dreams; (*c*) a terrible awakening.—Christianity the source of highest order: 1. It restores proper order in our affections and desires; 2. it sets objects before us in their proper order; 3. it sets our daily work in order; 4. it sets time and eternity in their proper order.—Solicitude, as indicating a divided heart, is closely connected with the eye that is evil, and with the attempt to serve two masters.—Carefulness and freedom from care.—Solicitude and everlasting negligence.—Solicitude a sinful distrust: 1. Of God; 2. of our neighbor; 3. of ourselves.—We need not be concerned for what is least, since we may obtain what is highest.—"*Seek ye first the kingdom of God.*" How do we learn it? 1. From the succession of things (Lord's day first, then work-day; prayer first, then work);* 2. mainly from our wants; 3. in a unique manner, when we surrender ourselves to God.—Our earthly calling is included in our heavenly calling.—He who prays well, will also work well.—All the wants of the children of God are supplied.—Nourishment and raiment are supplied without money in the kingdom of God.—Do not allow thoughts of the morrow to interfere with the duties of to-day: 1. Let them not distract you; 2. not tempt you; 3. not terrify you.—Wait each day upon God for to-day.—Let to-day's duty engross to-day's attention.—Preparation for to-morrow forms part of the duty of to-day.—Every day brings its burden from beneath, but also its help from above.

Starke:—Parallel passages: ch. xix. 21; Heb. xi. 26; xiii. 5; 1 Tim. vi. 9–17; James v. 3; Ps. lxii. 11.—We ought not to gather treasures from distrust of God's providence, nor from a desire to become rich; but to save, in the fear of God, to gather the crumbs, to make provision for our children, 2 Cor. xii. 14, is not displeasing to God.—*Hedinger:* What does it profit a man though he gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? xvi. 26; Phil. iii. 7, 8, 19, 20; Col. iii. 1, 2.—Not to have treasures, but yet to desire them is also sinful, 1 Tim. vi. 9; Ps. xlix. 17.—This warning applies also to the poor; for a beggar may set his heart as much upon one crown-piece as a rich man upon thousands, Luke xii. 19; Sir. xi. 17–19; Tob. iv. 7–9.—The heart, which is created only for God and for eternity, is dishonored and degraded if we set it on things which perish, and, so to speak, convert it into a moth, James v. 1, 2.—*Quesnel:* Avarice, 1 Tim. vi. 9.—God has given man earthly possessions for use, 1 Cor. vii. 31: he who is unwilling to employ them for that object, will frequently experience that they may either be taken from him, or disappear in his hands, Ps. xxxix. 7.—If we forsake our earthly possessions for the sake of Christ, we lay up for ourselves treasures in heaven, ch. xix. 29. The best of all riches is the kingdom of God in the soul, Luke xvii. 21.—If we frequently contemplate the reality, the continuance, and the excellency of heavenly treasures, our minds will not be engrossed with transient and contemptible things, Col. iii. 1, 2; Ps. lxxiii. 25.—The heavenly treasures, which are entrusted to God's keeping, are best kept, Luke xii. 21; Gal. vi. 9.—Passing possessions become everlasting, if they are employed for the glory of God, and in almsgiving. In this kind of exchange we cannot be losers, Prov. xi. 1; Ps. lxi. 2.—*For where your treasure is*, Phil. iii. 20; Col. iii. 1, 2.—What we love and esteem is always in our mind.—He whose every desire is in heaven, seeks nothing upon earth.—*Majus:*—*Totum mundum debet contemnere, qui sibi thesaurizat in cœlo;* Augustine, Ps. lxxiii. 25. Everything depends upon the heart, Isa. xxvi. 8, 9; Matt. xii. 35; Ps. vii. 10.—Be careful that your heart be single, sincere, and honest, or else all is lost.—Say not, in your carnal confidence, I have a good heart, Jer. xvii. 9; rather pray, Search me, O God, and try my heart, Ps. cxxxix. 23, 24.—Remain Thou, O God, in my heart, and let my heart remain in Thee; since it is created only for Thee, and Thou alone deservest it, cxxxii. 13, 14.—*The light of the body is the eye.* There is nothing more single than the eye of faith; follow that light, and you are safe.—The eyes are the road into the heart.—*Hedinger*, 1 Cor. xiii. 1.—The way of the righteous is a way of light, but that of sinners is only darkness. *Cramer*, Prov. xiv. 8.—*The service of mammon*, Hab. ii. 9.—Much here depends on the little word *serve.*—Whoso seeks heaven in the world, acts contrary even to nature and sound reason, 1 Kings xviii. 21; 2 Cor. vi. 14, 15.—The service of mammon an abominable bondage. *Majus.*—A covetous person renounces God, for covetousness is idolatry, Eph. v. 5; Col. iii. 5.—Not cared, well cared for, 1 Pet. v. 7.—All nature and every creature is like a ladder by which we may ascend to our heavenly Father.—The birds of the air are only the creatures of God, yet they are nourished. How much more shall we be provided for, who are not only His creatures, but called to be His children! Isa. lxiii. 16; Ps. ciii. 13.—If we would only consider our high origin, we should trust more to infinite goodness and wisdom, Isa. xliv. 2; Sir. xi. 23.—Just as solicitude is the punishment of unbelief, so much complaining is the fruit of unbelief.—Christians must differ from the heathen not only in respect of their faith, but also of their use of earthly things.—All the requirements of this life are added along with the one

* [Remember the familiar adage: "*Ora et labora;*" "*Bete und arbeite.*"—P. S.]

great possession of the kingdom of heaven.—Anxiety for the kingdom of God makes rich, since it bestows God Himself and all His blessings, Ps. lxxxiv. 12, lxxiii. 25.—The future belongs to God alone.

Gossner:—Ver. 21. What man loves attracts his heart like the magnet the iron. If your treasure is in the earth, your heart is in the earth also; if your treasure is in God and in heaven, your heart is in God and in heaven. *Braune*:—Every man has a master. Being freed from the service of sin, we become servants of righteousness.

Lisco:—Only *one* direction of the heart is right; to seek earthly things betrays inward defilement.—*To serve*, means to dedicate all that we are and have to another; in this sense we ought to serve God alone.—Prayer and labor.—Solicitude is foolish, being useless.

Gerlach:—Our minds and hearts must be fully directed toward God, so that everything else may be subordinate.—"Lord, Thou hast created us in Thine image, and our heart is without rest till it finds rest in Thee." (Augustine.)—In this and the following passage, care means anxious and distracting solicitude; not that carefulness which our calling demands (Phil. iv. 6; 1 Pet. v. 7; Heb. xiii. 5).—Ps. civ. 27; cxiv. 15. The circumstance, that many birds and other animals die of cold and hunger, does not affect the argument, since this is not the consequence of their want of solicitude.

Heubner:—If the heart and inclinations are at fault, the whole life shall be at fault.—But if the will is directed toward that which is good, everything will bear reference to that one grand object: there will be harmony and light within and without; man will understand his wants, and where they may be satisfied.—God demands our whole heart.—The service of the world is slavery and idolatry, that of Christ, liberty.—The tendency of materialism toward heathenism.—Difference between the absence of solicitude in a Christian and in a worldly man: 1. In the former, it springs from earnestness for the great concern; 2. in the latter, from thoughtlessness.—What is the right state so far as care is concerned: 1. Not to place what is heavenly on the same level with what is earthly (ver. 24); 2. not to assign the first place to what is earthly (vers. 25-32); but, 3. to assign the first place to what is heavenly (vers. 33, 34).—Wretched folly of earthly cares.—The great care of the Christian.—The decisive question: The world or Christ?—How Jesus leads to true freedom from care.*

Sermons on the pericope, vers. 24-34, by *Schleiermacher*, *Erdmann*, *Liebner*, *Reinhard*, *Dräseke*, *Steinmeyer*, and *Claus Harms*.

* [WORDSWORTH: "Our Lord does not forbid provident forethought (comp. 1 Tim. v. 8), as was imagined by the Euchites ('*qui volebant semper εὔχεσθαι et nunquam laborare*'), against whom St. Augustine wrote his book: '*De opere monachorum*.' But He forbids anxious, restless, and distrustful solicitude about earthly things, and this He does by seven considerations: 1. The care which God shows for our life and bodies; 2. for the inferior creatures which exist for our sake; 3. because all our care is vain without God; 4. from a consideration of the flowers and grass which God clothes and adorns; 5. because such solicitude is unchristian and heathenish; 6. because God adds everything necessary to them who seek *first* His kingdom; 7. because sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof. Comp. Phil. iv. 6; 1 Pet. v. 7."—P. S.]

5. Issue and characteristic manifestations of Pharisaism, as wicked harshness and abuse of what is holy. (Inquisitions and Indulgences.)

CHAPTER VII. 1-6.

1, 2 Judge not, that ye be not judged. For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be
3 judged: and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again.[1] And
why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the beam
4 that is in thine own eye? Or how wilt thou say to thy brother, Let me pull out the
5 mote out of thine eye; and, behold, a beam *is* in thine own eye? Thou hypocrite, first
cast out the beam out of thine own eye; and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the
6 mote out of thy brother,s eye. Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast
ye your pearls before [the][2] swine, lest they trample them under [with, Gr. ἐν] their
feet, and turn again and rend you.

[1] Ver. 2.—[The E. V. reads with the *textus rec.* ἀντιμετρηθήσεται; hence *again*. But the oldest MSS., including Cod. B. or Vaticanus (as published by Angelo Mai, and by Buttmann), and all the modern critical editors (Griesb., Scholz, Lachm., Tischend., Tregelles, Alf., Wordsw.) read μετρηθήσεται. So also Dr. Lange who omits *again* in his G. version. The reading ἀντιμετρ. was no doubt inserted from Luke vi. 38.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 6.—[The definite article in the Gr., as before *dogs*.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Connection.—De Wette and Tholuck—as formerly Calvin and Bucer—miss the connection between this and the preceding section. Olshausen suggests, that it lies in the idea that the character of the disciples is in direct opposition to prevailing views. Stier: Transition from a view of the inner man to what was around. Ewald: How the Christian ought to deal kindly and charitably toward those who are with-

out. Heubner: However earnestly and zealously you strive after perfection, be gentle and mild toward others. Our own explanation has been given in another place, and is substantially this. The spirit of anxious, corroding care, in opposition to cheerful confidence in God, marks the final stage of religious perversion, which manifests itself, on the one hand, by fanaticism and harsh condemnation of our neighbor, and on the other, by carnal and callous trifling with what is holy. For, these two extremes of fanaticism and profanity meet, just as spurious asceticism is generally connected with love of the world (*Leben Jesu*, ii. 2, 623). A passage analogous to that under consideration may serve to throw light both on the connection and the meaning of what otherwise would present some difficulty. In Matt. xxiv. 48 we read, "But and if that evil servant shall say in his heart, My lord delayeth his coming (worldly-mindedness and worldly care); and shall begin to smite his fellow-servants (fanatical judging), and to eat and drink with the drunken (misspending and profaning of what is holy), etc." Both these passages evidently bear reference to the judgment to come. Accordingly, we have the following antithesis: Be not surcharged with worldly cares for the morrow, but rather be filled with spiritual anxiety for the day of judgment. Judge not, that ye be not judged.

Ver. 1. **Judge not.**—The word *κρίνειν* here undoubtedly implies unkind, condemnatory judgment (Theophylact, Kuinoel, Tholuck, and others), as appears from the opposite clause, ἵνα μὴ κριθῆτε. Meyer denies this without reason, although the simile about the mote and the beam, proves that the expression cannot simply mean condemnation. It is general. Meyer is right in controverting the idea, that the word *κριθῆτε* refers exclusively to the judgment of other men (Erasmus, etc.). He applies it to the judgment to come; but ver. 6 proves that judgment on earth precedes the judgment of the last day. Uncharitable judgment receives its meed here as well as there. Comp. v. 22; vi. 14; the parable in xviii. 23; James ii. 13. Heubner: "*Judge not.* This neither refers (unconditionally) to our private judgment, nor to the official expression of our opinion which we may be bound in duty to give (which, however, may run into the sinful extreme here condemned). Least of all does it apply to the sentence pronounced by a judge (who should always bear in mind that he is under the holy law of God), but to those uncalled-for judgments which are neither dictated by duty, nor prompted by love. *Κρίνειν* therefore is here equivalent to *κατακρίνειν*." Comp. Luke.*

Ver. 2. **For with what judgment ye judge;** *i.e.*, the strict measure of your judgment will be made the standard according to which ye shall be judged (the *ἐν* is used instrumentally). As professedly you consider it *right*, you shall experience in your own case whether your standard be true or false. "God in His righteousness exercises the *jus talionis*. Truth and equity are, so to speak, elastic; and in the moral order of things, an unjust blow will recoil on him who has dealt it.—**And with what measure ye mete.**—*Μέτρον*, comp. Luke vi. 38.—Μετρήσεται, according to the majority of witnesses; in Luke, *ἀντιμετρηθήσεται*. A wider application of the idea of our relation toward our neighbor. The simile expresses the general principle, that according to our conduct toward our neighbors shall we receive at the hand of God, whether directly or through the instrumentality of men. In general, the figure, however, applies to harsh and uncharitable judgment.

Ver. 3. **The mote,** the splinter, κάρφος, *festuca*. "Thus in a Talmudical proverb, the word קִיסָם, for a small fault (Buxtorf, *Lexicon Talm.* p. 2080)." Δοκός, *trabs*, קוֹרָה, hyperbolically for a great fault. "As in ch. vi., the eye of the body here represents that of the mind; our own sinfulness deprives us of the capacity to judge the moral perversion of others." De Wette and Meyer deny this reference. But although it is true that the person who has the beam in his eye is characterized as, in a certain sense, seeing clearly, yet his vision is morbid. It also deserves notice, that the text refers to faults which are outwardly apparent. Fanaticism is specially bent on discovering and condemning errors of *knowledge*, or *heresies*. Viewed in this light, the mote in the eye might indicate a comparatively trifling dogmatical error, while the beam would refer to the destroying of the whole system and bearing of truth.

Ver. 4. **Let me pull out the mote.** Ἄφες, ἐκβάλω (the conjunctive of encouragement). His hypocrisy consists not merely in his refusing to see the mote in his own eye, but also in his disguising his want of charity for his brother under the garb of compassionate zeal.

Ver. 5. **Thou hypocrite.**—He is a hypocrite not merely in the judgment of God, but also in a subjective sense, since he applies not unto himself the measure by which he judges his brother.—Διαβλέψεις. We must not overlook the meaning of the compound verb. Then shalt thou be able to look into it (properly), and really to aid thy brother. But so long as the beam remains in thine own eye, thou art ill fitted to perform the operation upon the eye of another.

Ver. 6. **Give not that which is holy.**—Maldonatus, de Wette, Tholuck, deny that there is any connection between this and the preceding context. Kuinoel, Neander, Bengel, and Olshausen maintain that vers. 6–11 are not in their proper place. Stier suggests that Christ now proceeds to censure the opposite extreme of excessive laxity. Erasmus and Meyer hold that the expression, διαβλέψεις, leads to the idea, that it must still be our endeavor to improve our neighbor, and not to give that which is holy to the dogs. But, as in former cases, the *internal* connection between this and the preceding passage is, evidently, that the extremes of excessive harshness and of moral laxity generally meet. The *outward* connection lies in the contrast between the brother whose benefit is apparently the object of the harsh judgments pronounced against him, and the dogs and swine, to whom that which is holy is at the same time prostituted. Indeed, such conduct falls under the injunction, μὴ κρίνετε, since the judgment

* [Dr. Dav. Brown, in his Com. on the Gospels (Glasgow, 1863), *ad loc.*: "To 'judge' here (*κρίνειν*) does not exactly mean to pronounce condemnatory judgment (*κατακρίνειν*); nor does it refer to simple judging at all, whether favorable or the reverse. The context makes it clear that the thing here condemned is that disposition to look unfavorably on the character and actions of others, which leads invariably to the pronouncing of rash, unjust, and unlovely judgments upon them. . . . What the Lord aims at is the spirit out of which they spring. Provided we eschew this unlovely spirit, we are not only warranted to sit in judgment upon a brother's character and actions, but, in the exercise of a necessary discrimination, are often constrained to do so for our own guidance. It is the violation of the law of love involved in the exercise of a censorious disposition which alone is here condemned. And the argument against it—'that ye be not judged'—confirms this: 'that your own character and actions be not pronounced upon with the like severity;' that is, at the great day."—P. S.]

of sinners is hastened and increased when what is holy is cast before, or even forced upon them (Matt. xiii. 10). Hence to withhold that which is holy from the dogs, and pearls from swine, is the opposite of judging them, and only what is right and proper in the circumstances.—**That which is holy,** τὸ ἅγιον.—Von der Hardt, Paulus, and Tholuck refer it to the sacrificial meat, or to the provision of the priests. Meyer controverts this view without adequate grounds. The difference between δῶτε and the βάλητε, which follows, deserves notice. The word διδόναι seems to imply—however horrible it may seem—that the dogs receive it. The expression is evidently symbolical not only of Gospel *truth* (the provision of the priests), but also of Christian fellowship, and the privileges of the Church, such as the sacraments. But if this διδόναι betokened a most iniquitous laxity, the βάλλειν of pearls before swine is the result of a laxity which almost amounts to madness. Such, then, is the upshot of Pharisaism—profanation of what is holy and good beyond rational belief.—The **pearls,** an image of what is most precious. According to Gesenius (in Rosenmüller's *Repertorium*, i. 128), the figure is applied by the Arabs to well-chosen words or apt sayings. De Wette: A figure of pure conviction, and of the noblest disposition. But if by what is *holy* we understand the highest religious possessions, the term, *pearls*, may be applied to the highest moral possessions, which were specially prostituted by the Pharisees. It has been suggested, that the figure alludes to the resemblance of pearls with peas and acorns. Certain it is, that the swine touch with their snouts everything resembling food. As this casting of pearls before swine—however foolish—must have had some show of reason, it may perhaps represent an attempt of satisfying their cravings. And such indeed is the true character of laxity; it prostitutes what is highest and holiest, to satisfy the animal and the devilish propensities in man. Both dogs and swine were unclean animals, according to the law of Moses (see Sept. 1 Kings xxi. 19; xxii. 38; 2 Sam. iii. 8; ix. 8; 2 Kings viii. 13; Matt. xv. 26; Rev. xxii. 15, etc.); and, indeed, throughout antiquity generally (Horat. *Epist.* i. 2, 22: *vixisset canis immundus vel amica luto sus*). The expression refers to what is impure and wild in our nature; more particularly, the word **dogs,** alludes to that which is low, unclean, heretical; and **swine,** to the hostile element, and to stubborn resistance. Augustine regarded the dogs as *oppugnatores*, or hostile persecutors, and the swine as *contemtores veritatis*, or unholy persons who were incapable of being impressed by what was spiritual. But the context does not bear out this distinction, as the swine are represented as ultimately the *oppugnatores*. "St. Bernard was wont to quote this verse, in order to incite the Christian knights to the Crusades. Schröckh, *Church Hist.* xxv. 114." Heubner.

Lest they trample them with their feet, etc. —Of course the pearls could not be broken, but only trampled in the mire.—As this refers only to the swine, Theophylact, Hammond, and others, apply the στραφέντες ῥήξωσιν to the dogs. But it applies likewise to the swine. Although nothing is said about the conduct of the dogs, the horrible sin of giving that which is holy to the dogs sufficiently condemns itself, even without mentioning ulterior consequences. Besides, the dogs ultimately become swine, just as that which is holy is further designated as pearls, and the iniquity of the first action passes into the madness of the second. At last the full consequences appear, when the swine turn from the gift to the giver, and rend the profane sinners. It is needless to inquire whether swine can literally rend; at all events, they may tear off the flesh. (Besides, the word ῥήξωσιν, like the *dirumpere* in the Vulgate, may allude to the disruption and destruction of the communion of the disciples.) Στραφέντες, **turning** [the *again* of the E. V. is superfluous], evidently denotes the enmity (Chrysostom) and the fury of the swine, on account of the deception practised upon them. Such, then, are the twofold consequences: that which is holy, with all its treasures, is lost in iniquity and mire; while its unfaithful and vile administrators also perish in their sin.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The passage is evidently intended to describe the judgment awaiting the false spiritualism of those worldly-minded Pharisees and scribes. Hence the passage contains no reference to the proper conduct of the disciples, in opposition to that of the synagogue. They are merely warned against imitating those sinners; the Lord in His mercy concealing under a simile the fearful judgment that awaits all who are guilty of such profanity.

2. It is a historical fact, meeting us both during the Old Testament dispensation (at the destruction of Jerusalem) and in the annals of the Church, that carnal zealots, while pronouncing harsh judgment against their brethren, gave that which is holy to the dogs. Fanaticism and indifferentism were combined in the hypocrisy of the Pharisees, and we meet them but too frequently at later periods; as, for example, in the Inquisition and the traffic in indulgences, and under many other, though perhaps more subtle, forms.

3. We may connect with this passage the prophecy in Revelation, which represents the beast out of the sea as ultimately bearing rule over the external sanctuary (Rev. xiii. 14).

4. From this disclosure of the lowest depth to which the righteousness of the Pharisees descends, we may profitably look to the opposite path, by which the disciples of Jesus ascend into the kingdom of heaven. Theirs is a gradual progress through suffering to the glorious height of purity and of love, to fellowship with the prophets, and to that final reward which awaits them in the kingdom of God; while the Pharisees, with their spurious sanctimoniousness, are at last degraded to the level of those who are compared to impure beasts, and who become the instruments of judgment upon them.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

"*Judge not, that ye be not judged.*" For, 1. with your own judgment (according to your own judicial procedure) shall ye be judged; 2. with your measure (of punishment) shall it be measured to you; 3. by your own judgment the beam will be found in your own eye—the greater guilt will attach to you.—By anticipating the judgment of God by our own judgment, we call down judgment upon ourselves. For, 1. we take the place of the Judge (anticipate Him); 2. of the last day (anticipate it); 3. of inexorable justice (anticipate it).—A tendency to judge others is legalism in its full development as hypocrisy.—To take pleasure in judging, is to take no pleasure in saving. Hence it is opposed, 1. to the Gospel; 2. to the Spirit of Christ; 3. to the mercy

of God; 4. to our calling as Christians.—Difference between judgment in the way of duty, and in contravention of duty: 1. The former is done in the prosecution of our calling, and accompanied by pity; 2. the latter is done contrary to our calling as Christians, and accompanied by pleasure in condemning.—Wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself, Rom. ii. 1.—Needless judgment: 1. Its origin (self-righteousness and want of love, self-exaltation and pride, self-satisfaction and hypocrisy); 2. its various forms (speaking evil, casting suspicion, detracting, putting the worst construction upon matters, calumniating, accusing of heresy); 3. its poisonous fruit (injury of evangelical truth, injury to our neighbor whom we judge, injury to ourselves).—He who judges without mercy, converts both heaven and earth into a place of judgment. To look upon the world with the eye of a judge, is to see it enveloped in the flames of judgment. The consequence is, that we lose, 1. our faith; 2. our love; 3. our hope.—As we measure to our neighbor, we mete out to ourselves.—As we measure to our neighbor, it shall be measured to us, 1. by God; 2. by man.—When tempted to judge, let us remember that everything around may rise up in judgment against us.—The mote and the beam. The judgment about the mote, sinful, 1. because it is an assumption on the part of one who himself needs to be cured; 2. because it is a hypocritical offer of aid, on the part of one who is destitute of love; 3. because it is a lying pretence of ability to help, on the part of one who himself is helpless.—The hypocrite derives his own spiritual greatness from detraction of his brother. 1. His aggrandisement springs from the littleness of his brother; 2. his glory from tarnishing him; 3. his adorning from stripping him; 4. his vindication from condemning him.—If our justification flow from looking to Christ, we shall be owned and exalted; but if from an uncharitable and harsh estimate of our neighbor, we shall only descend lower and lower.—A Pharisee with the beam in his eye attempting to relieve the eye of his neighbor, the most ridiculous, were it not the saddest sight.—"He shall have judgment without mercy who has shown no mercy" (James ii. 13).—"*Give not that which is holy to the dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine;*" or, the sin of prostituting what is holy in faith and life: 1. How it is done; 2. how it brings its own condemnation.—Harsh judgment and sinful prostitution of what is holy springing from the same root: 1. as exemplified by the spirit of traditionalism; 3. from history (Pharisaism, Mediævalism, seventeenth century); 4. as apparent from the temptations of our inner life.—The end of false spirituality in profligacy.—The Pharisees at last the prey of dogs and swine.—The goal of the disciples of Jesus, and that of zealots for tradition.

Starke:—Judge not from partiality, James ii. 1; nor from suspiciousness or want of love, 1 Cor. xiii. 7; nor from self-love or censoriousness, vers. 3, 4; nor from envy and malice, Job xxxi. 29; Prov. xxiv. 17; Sir. viii. 6.—That ye be not judged, or incur Divine judgment, Rom. xiv. 10.—To judge is the prerogative of God. Hence, to assume this function without special authority, were to deprive God of His glory, or to have the beam in our own eye.—The Lord here warns young converts of a danger to which they are peculiarly liable: that of judging others, and forgetting themselves. Then He adverts to dangers to which His disciples generally are liable, Luke ix. 48. Such passages as 2 Tim. iii. 6–10; 1 Tim. v. 1, 13, 19; Gal. vi. 1; Rom. xiv. 4, refer to this zeal without knowledge.—God has reserved to Himself alone to judge the human heart. Learn to know thyself, Gal. vi. 1; Luke xviii. 11.—The best remedy against speaking evil of others, is to look attentively at our own heart and conduct before censuring others.—He who is unspiritual, being under the power of great sins, is incapable of showing to others their transgressions, Rom. ii. 19; John viii. 4–9.—He who only delights in self, and looks down upon others, is blinded and condemned.—Majus: Rom. xiv. 1; Prov. v. 21, 22.—*Difficilius est, præstare, quam exigere, melius exemplo docere, quam dictis.* Hilarius in h. l. Hab. iii. 15.—Let our reformation commence within, Ps. l. 19.—Dogs, swine; Prov. ix. 8; 1 Cor. x. 21; Phil. iii. 2. Sanctity of the Lord's table, Rev. xxii. 15; 2 Pet. ii. 20–22.

Gossner:—Self-love makes blind toward ourselves, and sharp-sighted toward the actions of our neighbor.

Gerlach:—The passage refers to the disposition to judge, and the assumption of superiority over our neighbor.

Lisco:—It is a fundamental principle of the kingdom of God, that no indulgence shall be shown to those who have shown no indulgence to others (ch. xviii. 23), but that strict retribution shall be awarded them.—Aspire not to be the spiritual adviser of another, if thine own conscience is not clear, Luke vi. 41, 42.—But, on the other hand, prudence and a proper judgment of others are indispensable, if our spiritual welfare is not to be recklessly exposed to danger.—Beware of communicating the gracious experiences of your heart to daring, vicious, or hardened persons.—Brief notes: The word of God is the sanctuary by which all other things are hallowed. The dogs are those who persecute the word, upon whom we may not force what is holy; the swine, those who despise the word, having surrendered themselves to carnal lusts.

Heubner:—Our conduct toward others will be the measure by which God will judge us.—Cast out, or pull out; *i. e.*, do not spare thyself, however painful it may be; after that, see how thou canst take the mote, etc., *i. e.*, deal gently and cautiously with thy neighbor.—It is a very difficult and delicate matter to improve others, and requires great carefulness.—You do not cast away your pearls to be trodden down by beasts; neither are you to prostitute to unholy persons that which is holy,—the glorious truths of Christianity, the sacraments, and your spiritual experiences.—This, however, does not imply that we are not to seek the spiritual good even of such unholy persons.—Christianity must remain a mystery from the profane world—and yet be publicly proclaimed.

III.

Directions how to avoid the errors and sins of the Pharisees and scribes, and to enter upon the way which leads into the kingdom of heaven. Practical order of grace.—*Conclusion of the Sermon on the Mount.*

Chapter VII. 7–29.

(*Vers.* 15–23 *the Gospel for the* 8*th Sunday after Trinity.*)

7 Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be
8 opened unto you: For every one that asketh receiveth; and he that seeketh findeth;
9 and to him that knocketh it shall be opened[1] [it is opened]. Or what man is there of
10 you,[2] whom[3] [of whom] if his son ask bread, will he give him a stone? Or if he ask
11 a fish, will he give him a serpent? If ye then, being evil, know how to give good
gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father which [who] is in heaven
12 give good things to them that ask him? Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that
men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets.
13 Enter ye in at [through, διά] the strait gate: for wide *is* the gate, and broad *is* the
way, that leadeth to destruction, and many there be [are they] which [who] go in
14 thereat: Because [for][4] strait *is* the gate, and narrow *is* the way, which leadeth unto
life, and few there be [are they] that find it.
15 Beware of false prophets, which [who] come to you in sheep's clothing, but inward-
16 ly they are ravening wolves. Ye shall know them by their fruits. Do men gather
17 grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? Even so every good tree bringeth forth good
18 fruit; but a [the, τό] corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit. A good tree cannot bring
19 forth evil fruit, neither [nor] *can* a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit. Every tree that
20 bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire. Wherefore by their
fruits ye shall know them.
21 Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of
22 heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which [who] is in heaven. Many
will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in
23 thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works? And
then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work
iniquity.
24 Therefore whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken
25 him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock[5]: And the rain descended,
and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell not:
26 for it was founded upon a rock.[5] And every one that heareth these sayings of mine,
and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man, which [who] built his house
27 upon the sand[5]: And the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew,
and beat upon that house; and it fell: and great was the fall of it.
28 And it came to pass, when Jesus had ended these sayings, the people were aston-
29 ished at his doctrine: For he taught them as *one* having authority, and not as the
[their][7] scribes.

[1] Ver. 8.—[*It shall* be opened according to the *text rec.*: ἀνοιγήσεται. But some of the oldest authorities, among which is the Vatican Cod. B. (*see* the ed. of Angelo Mai, and Buttmann), also Lachmann, Tregelles, and Conant, read ἀνοίγεται, *it is* opened, which seems to correspond better to the preceding *receiveth*, and *findeth*. Dr. Conant's remark is not without force: "The beautiful antithesis, made by the future and present tenses in vers. 7 and 8, is marred at the close by the return to the future, in the faulty form of the Received Text, and in the Versions that follow it. In ver. 7 the imperative is properly followed by the future tense, because the compliance and its reward are both in the future time; but in ver. 8, the present (*he that asketh*) is properly followed by the same (*receiveth*), and so of the other two clauses. The propriety and point of expression, which are so striking a characteristic of our Lord's manner in all His discourses, should not be lost or marred in the version of them." Tischendorf, Alford, Wordsworth, and Lange in his G. version, adhere to the Received Text. Meyer, otherwise so accurate in all that pertains to verbal exegesis, and Lange take no notice of this difference.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 9.—[Tregelles edits: ἤ τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν ἄνθρωπος, omitting ἐστιν, on the authority of Cod. Vaticanus as compared by Birch. But both Angelo Mai and Buttmann in their editions of the Vatican Codex give ἐστιν. The discrepancy is solved by the fact that ἐστιν is the marginal reading, but not *a correctore*, as Birch supposed, but *a prima manu*, as Vercellone in the second ed. of the published text, and Buttmann explain.—P. S.]

[3] Ver. 9.—Ὃν in Codd. B. C., etc. The Recepta adds ἐάν, *if.* [Dr. Conant: "*Of whom; for whom*, which is ungrammatical. . . . The construction of the sentence is not, indeed, rhetorically exact; but it belongs to that graceful negligence of art and rule, which is the peculiar charm of the colloquial style, and is no less so in English than in Greek."—P. S.]

[4] Ver. 14.—Ὅτι [*for*]. This could easily be changed into τί [*how* strait], which is supported by many authorities and adopted by Griesbach, Lachmann, Scholz.

[5] Ver. 24.—[It would be better here and in vers. 25, 26 to leave out the art. in Engl. and to translate "*upon rock*," and "*upon sand*," instead of "*a rock*" (which might mean some particular rock), and "*the sand*." The Greek has in both cases the definite art. (τὴν πέτραν and τὴν ἄμμον), which here designates classes of substances. Some commentators refer the *rock* to Christ, as Cornel. à Lapide: "Mystice *petra* est Christus; unde Glossa 'Ille ædificat in Christo qui quod audit ab illo facit.'" So also Alford and Wordsworth. In this case we ought to translate "upon *the* rock," and "upon sand."—P. S.]

[6] Ver. 29.—[The word *one* is inserted by the E. V. and rather weakens the force of the expression ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων. Lange translates: *wie im Besitz der Macht.*—P. S.]

[7] Ver. 29.—[The critical editions read αὐτῶν, and Lange translates accordingly. Some add: καὶ οἱ φαρισαῖοι.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Connection with the context.—De Wette and Meyer deny the connection with the preceding section.—Heubner correctly: In order to attain the Christian wisdom formerly mentioned, it is absolutely necessary to seek it by prayer.

To our mind, the transition is plain. In the former section, the awful danger of the judgment to come was set before the disciples. Weak, helpless, and conscious of their inability to escape this judgment in their own strength, or to attain the righteousness of the kingdom of heaven, the encouraging call meets them, "*Ask, and it shall be given you,*" etc. Seek a refuge in the New Dispensation, since the Old is to perish amid such judgments. But the general connection is even more definite. In the Sermon on the Mount, properly so called, the Lord had described the righteousness of the kingdom of heaven; while in its application, or in the practical address which followed it, He had exposed the false righteousness of the Pharisees and scribes, both in doctrine and in life. In the passage before us, He now teaches them how to avoid the way of destruction, and to enter upon that of life. Methodology or order of succession in the kingdom of heaven: 1. What to seek, vers. 7–14; 2. what to avoid, vers. 13–23; 3. the evidence of genuine religion, as exhibited in the parable of the judgment, vers. 24–27.

Ver. 7. **Ask, and it shall be given you.**—The three terms, **ask, seek,** and **knock,** αἰτεῖτε, ζητεῖτε, κρούετε, indicate a gradation. Some critics, as de Wette and Meyer, hold that all the three terms refer to prayer, in accordance with the remark of Luther: "By this the Lord exhorts us the more strenuously to prayer." Somewhat differently, Bengel seems to refer the terms to different acts: "1. *Contra indigentiam vestram dona petite; 2. quærite quæ amisistis occulta, recipientes vos ex errore; 3. pulsate, qui foris estis, ut intromittamini.*" [Ask for gifts to meet your needs; seek the hidden things which you have lost, and return from your error; knock ye who are without, that ye may be admitted within.] But Bengel evidently connects the idea of prayer with the second and third degree as well as with the first; and Luther meant to say that the burden and the object of our prayers were increasingly to assume a more definite shape. Tholuck: "In practical application, the term αἰτεῖτε is generally referred to prayer, ζητεῖτε to our endeavors, and κρούετε to the investigation of the Scriptures." We regard the passage as marking a climax,—the word ζητεῖτε, like בִּקֵּשׁ in Jer. xxix. 13, 14, indicating earnest desire; and κρούειν perseverance, even though an answer seemed denied. To *ask*, indicates the *want* of an object, which can only be obtained by free gift; to *seek*, that it has been *lost;* to *knock*, that it has been *shut up*—hence this prayer which is both the work of life and the evidence of life.

Ver. 8. **For every one that asketh, receiveth.**—Such, indeed, is the invariable rule. Perseverance in prosecuting that to which we may fairly lay claim, is generally crowned with success even among men. How much more, then, if our object be the kingdom of heaven, and our efforts those of prayer! (The conditions of it appear from the context.) This applies, in the first place, to the *subjective* bearing of our spiritual efforts. The following verses show that it is equally true *objectively*, or with reference to Him from whom the blessing is sought.

Vers. 9 and 10. **Or what man?**—The word *or* does not mark the antithesis,—If it were not so,—but refers to the contrast between the objective and the subjective certitude of prayer.—The sudden turn in the address is exceedingly striking: "Or where is there a man of you whom his son shall ask for bread (and who shall—no!),—he will surely not give him a stone?" The meaning is: However wicked any of you may be, if his son were to ask him for bread, surely he would not give him a stone, etc. **Bread** and **stone, fish** and **serpent,** however similar in outward appearance, are vastly different in reference to the nourishment they afford. There is evidently a gradation in the expressions. The most hardened parent would not meet the entreaty of his child by such cruel deception. It is noticeable that the text does not refer to the possibility of not being heard, but that it sets before us the alternative of a genuine and a deceptive answer. This indicates that, if God were not to hear our prayer, our state would not simply continue what it had been before, but that the heart would become a stone, and meat for the serpent.

Ver. 11. **Being evil.**—Meyer: Although, compared with God, ye are morally evil (πρὸς ἀντιδιαστολὴν τῆς ἀγαθότητος τοῦ Θεοῦ, Euthymius Zigabenus). But this "*comparison* with God" must not be pressed. We had rather explain it: Before God, measured even according to the human standard, ye are evil. The statement undoubtedly implies the sinfulness of man, both in its universality and in its limitation by traits of humanity and kindness." *

Know how to give good gifts—not, *soletis dare* (Maldonatus). The reference here is not to the ability of man, in opposition to his actual performance, but to the powerful and ineradicable instinct of paternal affection, which, in a certain sense, and for certain

* [Not: "*in its inseparable connection with human nature,*" as the Edinb. trsl. misunderstands the original: "*Bedingtheit durch die Züge der Humanität, der Menschlichkeit.*"—P. S.]

purposes, is capable of overcoming even our πονηρία. If the paternal feelings of man are indestructible, how much more will the goodness of God continue for ever!—A conclusion *à minori ad majus.* **Good things;** in Luke xi. 13, more definitely, the Holy Spirit. The object is here left more indefinite, as opening up in measure as we seek it.

Ver. 12. **Therefore all things whatsoever ye would.**—Ewald maintains that this should have been inserted in ch. v. 44, before the word ἀγαπᾶτε. The word "*therefore*" implies, indeed, a reference to the preceding context; which, however, we find in the close of the former verse, where the free mercy of God was set before the disciples. As if it were said: In prayer commit yourself with perfect confidence to the God who giveth every good and perfect gift; but on that very ground imitate Him in your conduct toward your neighbors. God answers prayer, for it is His Spirit who teaches us to pray. Do to your neighbor what is due to him: the demand which he addresses to you will be found in your own heart, in the shape of your demand upon your neighbor. Pray with unbounded confidence, and with the same measure bestow your affection upon your neighbor. You will descry in your own hearts what this measure should be. From this the connection will be evident. The sentence is the ethical counterpart to the promise: "Ask, and it shall be given you," and is analogous to the addition: "as we forgive our debtors," in the fifth petition of the Lord's Prayer. On similar sayings among heathen philosophers, comp. Tholuck. Wetstein quotes the following from the Rabbins: *Quod tibi ipsi odiosum est, proximo ne facias, nam hæc est tota lex.* There the rule is given negatively, but here positively; and hence in infinitely richer and deeper bearing. De Wette thinks that the injunction to love our neighbor as ourselves, implies much the same thing, viz., moral equality, and does not express the distinctive excellency of Christian morality, which is pure, disinterested love; for it refers not to the matter of our conduct, and we may possibly expect from others something that is evil, such as flattery. But it should be noticed that the statement applies, in the first instance, to the form or mode of our conduct. It is not said, "Do ye even *that* to them," but, "Do ye even *so* to them (οὕτως)." We are not to do to people whatsoever they ask from us, but we are to act toward them *according* to what we would expect at their hands. The measure of our demands is also to be the measure of our self-denial and devotion. Thus our own heart will tell us, by our requests upon others, what is the request, and what the claim, of our neighbor. In other words, our every demand must become a performance. But this implies the mortification of egotism; and thus, what in the first place referred to the manner, applies also to the matter, of our conduct. Viewed in this light, the statement contains an injunction of love to our neighbor, according to the measure of our love to ourselves. The "peculiarly Christian element" in this injunction, is the novelty of the measure which we are to apply to our love to our neighbor. None of us would ask flattery from our neighbor, knowing it to be such. What we desire from our neighbors is, that they shall be ministers of good, not of evil, angels, not devils, to us: hence our duty toward them corresponds with this our demand.—**For this is the law and the prophets.**—Matt. xxii. 39; Rom. xiii. 9.

Vers. 13 and 14. **Enter ye in through the strait gate.**—*First* the *gate*, and *then* the *way* (Meyer, Bengel); and not the reverse, as ascetic misunderstanding would have it,—first the way, and then the gate (Calovius: the way,—the life on earth; the gate,—*exitus vitæ*). Similarly de Wette and Tholuck. Perhaps the mistake has arisen from mixing up this with another figurative expression: "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle," etc., Matt. xix. 24. Nor can the expression εἰσέρχεσθαι διά, in ver. 13, determine our interpretation, since the same words are afterward applied to the broad way (εἰσερχόμενοι δι' αὐτῆς). The figure becomes even more striking, if we recall to mind the former advice, to *knock*. We see, as it were, two cities before us. The pilgrim must quit the one, which is the old world, over which judgment is to burst (Bunyan's Pilgrimage), and enter into the other, which is the kingdom of heaven, where alone the soul can find a refuge. Again, viewing the passage in the light of the judgment, which, according to our Lord's prediction, was to overtake Pharisaism, we may consider ancient Jerusalem as the city which must be forsaken. But there are two gates by which it may be left. One of these is strait,* being the righteousness of Christ; the road is narrow—the seven beatitudes; and few are they that enter in thereat to eternal life. But there is also a wide gate—the legalism of the Pharisees, and a broad way—that of external Judaism; and many there are which hurry along this road to that awful historical destruction,—the great ἀπώλεια of the Jewish nation. All this is but the outward manifestation of the eternal contrast between the children of light and the children of darkness. In this sense, the gate serves as the figure of their choice; and the way, as that of their walk and conduct. By the strait gate we understand *humility*, repentance, and renunciation of the world, through poverty in spirit. The wide gate is the self-righteousness of the Pharisees, or the spurious riches of a piety which is combined with the service of mammon. Similarly, the narrow way is the prosecution of those spiritual attainments described in the seven beatitudes; while the broad way indicates that corruption in doctrine and life, which, passing from one extreme to the other, renders the way so wide and ill-defined. The contrast between the goal of these two ways is exceedingly significant. In the one case, it is **life**; in the other, **destruction**,—first, as matter of inward experience, then of outward fact, and, lastly, of eternal destiny (rest and unrest, deliverance and destruction, salvation and condemnation). The figurative language of this passage is closely connected with what precedes about the relation of Christians to their fellow-men. It is your duty to devote yourselves to others,—not according to the measure which they demand at your hand, but according as you would have them do to you. You are not to follow the multitude on the broad way, but to seek with the few, the elect, the strait gate, in order to knock at the door of the kingdom of heaven. Such is the transition from the injunction of what we are to *seek*, to that of what we are to *avoid*.

Ver. 15. **Beware of false prophets.**—If it is our duty to beware of the dangerous example given us by the great crowd of those who go astray, we must be even more careful against the small but strong influence of false prophets, derived from the powers of darkness. Meyer: "The ψευδοπροφῆται are not Pharisees, nor impostors such as Judas of Gali-

* [Chrysostom: στενὴ ἡ πύλη, οὐχ ἡ πόλις, strait is the gate, but not the heavenly city to which it leads.—P. S.]

lee (Acts v. 37; Joseph. *De Bell. Jud.* ii. 13, 4), but false Christian teachers (Matt. xxiv. 11, 24), as appears from vers. 21–23. Comp. Chrysostom, Calvin, Grotius." But the admonition "*to beware*" is evidently connected with the last clause of the former verse, "*few are they that find it;*" showing that these false prophets must somehow stand related to the Pharisees.—The great danger which ye shall have to encounter upon the new or narrow way, will arise from the influence of false prophets. The Lord foresaw that Pharisaism would in part merge with Christianity, when its representatives would become "false prophets," or heresiarchs. It was easy to infer, that along with such Jewish forms of error, the corruptions of heathen philosophy and mythology would find their way into the Church. The main idea of the simile is the disguise of an old and evil kind under a new garb of piety. They come to you (*already*) **in sheep's clothing.** De Wette: "Not literally in sheep's skins, which the old prophets wore (Grotius, Kuinoel), but in clothing such as sheep wear, *i. e.*, gentle and meek in their outward appearance." Bengel: *Vestibus ut si essent oves.* The expression refers, however, not merely to their gentle and mild exterior, but also to their profession of Christianity—the garb of the lamb; while the term, "**inwardly ravening wolves**" (Acts xx. 29), indicates not only their malice generally, but the old enmity and opposition to Christianity, Matt. x. 16.

Ver. 16. **By their fruits.**—This is the decisive evidence. Jerome, Calvin, Calovius, and others, refer the expression "*fruits*" to the *false doctrine* of these prophets; Tholuck, Meyer, and others, to their *works.** But the passage alludes not to the works of ordinary professors, but to those of false prophets. These, as Spener remarks, are schools, institutions, doctrinal principles, etc.; which, of course, are closely connected with their moral characters and conduct (comp. 1 John iv. 1). The character of the Ebionite and Gnostic heresies certainly appeared in the works of their professors, in the harsh fanaticism of the one, and the antinomianism of the other, while both exhibited the sectarianism, proselytism, and hypocrisy common to all heresies.

Vers. 16–19. Illustration of this principle from nature. At first sight, we might have expected that the idea should be presented in the opposite form. *Shall we look for thorns upon the vine*, etc.? But the Lord first shows what we should seek, viz., good fruit, such as *grapes* and *figs*. Compared with such fruit, the false prophets are *thorns* and *thistles*. "Ἄκανθαι, or ἄκανθα, is the general name for all kinds of thorns, of which the most common bears small black berries not unlike grapes, while the flower of the τρίβολοι may be compared with the fig." The false prophets resemble sharp thorns, from their fanatical and harsh traditionalism; and thistles, from their proselytizing spirit, which takes hold of and clings to every part of your person and dress. Then follows the general law of nature: As is the tree, such is its fruit; as the state of mind, so the outward manifestation. Nor can it be otherwise. What applies to thorns and thistles, holds equally true of every kind of tree.—By **the good tree** is evidently meant the fruit-tree. It is not so easy to determine what is meant by the δένδρον σαπρόν. Σαπρός signifies, in the first place, *rotten;* but Meyer is wrong in applying the expression to decayed trees, which yielded only unwholesome fruit. Σαπρόν means also what is *bad* or *unuseable;* Matt. xiii. 48, applied to fish (de Wette). Even old wine, if acrid, may be designated as σαπρός. Hence the idea here implied, seems to be that of the old and wild growth of nature, in opposition to the new and precious fruit (comp. Gen. ii. and Col. ii. 8. Philosophy κατὰ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου).—The judgment denounced against false prophets in ver. 19, is intended to give emphasis to the admonition repeated in ver. 20, "*By their fruits ye shall know them.*"

Ver. 21. **Not every one that saith unto Me, Lord, Lord.**—De Wette: "A warning against merely external worship of the Saviour, or merely external communion with Him, ver. 21. Chrysostom, Jerome, Augustine, Maldonatus, and after them Tholuck, erroneously refer this to the false prophets, as if it were a further explanation of the judgment denounced upon them in ver. 19. Meyer regards it as an application of the preceding verses to Christian teachers. But these are only spoken of in ver. 22. In another point also we dissent from this critic. He considers this verse as expressing in plain and literal terms what had been figuratively conveyed in ver. 16. The real connection between this and the preceding verses is as follows: In vers. 15–20, the Lord had spoken of those who taught *destructive* doctrines (mark the images of *wolves*, *thorns*, and *thistles*); while here He refers to all (whether teachers or taught) who rest satisfied with a mere profession, without reality."—*Not every one*, etc. The truly pious, therefore, are among the professors.

Ver. 22. **Many will say to Me.**—This marks another stage, being addressed to those who have done certain things in the name of Jesus, but without His Spirit. De Wette rightly observes, that it does not apply to those who spread dangerous doctrines. Meyer holds that the term *prophesied* points back to the false prophets of ver. 16. Against this, see, however, 1 Cor. xiii. 2. In general, the passage is intended further to develop the idea formerly expressed.

In that day.—As in ch. xi. 24, and in Luke x. 12, ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κρίσεως.

Τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι, **by Thy name,** or *through* Thy name, not *in* Thy name (Mark ix. 38),—*i. e.*, by means of Thy name.

Prophesied, προεφητεύσαμεν.—Grotius and Fritzsche understand it as *prophesying;* Meyer, as referring to the prophetic office of the early teachers, 1 Cor. xii. 10. But this included prophesying in the stricter sense.

We have cast out devils, etc., δαιμόνια ἐξεβάλομεν, etc.—On the difference between this and δυνάμεις πολλάς, κ. τ. λ., comp. 1 Cor. xii. The latter passage applies more especially to miracles of healing (χαρίσματα ἰαμάτων), while the casting out of devils has its analogon in the ἐνεργήματα δυνάμεων. The last clause of the verse, however, must be taken rather in a general sense than as applying to any particular manifestation. It applies to religious enthusiasm generally, whether operating on the intellect, the will, or the sympathies.

* [Alford: "The καρποί are both their corrupt doctrines and their vicious practices, as contrasted with the outward shows of almsgiving, prayer, and fasting, their sheep's clothing to deceive." Wordsworth: "From the fruits of *their teaching;* not from their acts *alone*, because acts seemingly virtuous are often nothing more than the sheep's clothing in which the wolf wraps himself in order that he may deceive and devour the sheep." Whedon: "*Their fruits*—their own actions and the moral tendency of their doctrines." D. Brown: "Not their doctrines . . . for that corresponds to the tree itself; but the practical effect of their teaching, which is the proper fruit of the tree."—P. S.]

but of a theurgic character (τῷ σῷ, not ἐν τῷ σῷ), for purposes of self-exaltation, and in the spirit of boastfulness, which Luther points out by repeating, in his version, the expression, "*have we not*," three times. But, despite their works, the true foundation is awanting,—Christian love having never been called into exercise: 1 Cor. xiii.; John xiii. 34, 35.

Ver. 23. **And then will I profess unto them.**—The expression may mean, *explain;* although it alludes, no doubt, to their profession, as if the Judge Himself were grieved in having to explain it to those self-deluded persons. At any rate, it indicates that the hollowness of many a fair appearance will only be exposed on that day.

I never knew you.—If the fruit of love does not appear, the inmost individuality of man, that which constitutes his personal character, is not brought out. For practical purposes we may explain it: I never knew you as My people.

Depart from Me—Ps. vi. 9; Matt. xxv. 41—**ye that work iniquity.**—Not merely on account of what is awanting in them, but as having deceived themselves and others, and unwarrantably used the name of the Lord for the purpose of advancing their own honor.

Vers. 24–27. **Therefore, whosoever heareth.**—This is an inference from the preceding warning, presenting the most terrible form of judgment—that which is to overtake those who feign greatness of faith, or high spiritual advancement. At the same time, it forms also a most solemn and striking conclusion to the whole Sermon on the Mount.

Ὁμοιώσω.—The meaning of the active mood is explained by the passive reading ὁμοιωθήσεται, which is supported by many authorities. The latter evidently signifies, "he shall be esteemed, or treated like." Accordingly, the active mood here must be rendered: I shall esteem, or treat, him in the judgment (Tholuck and Meyer). The circumstance, that the verb in the active mood generally signifies, *to liken* (xi. 16; Luke xiii. 18–21), would appear to favor the passive reading.

Upon a [the] rock.—Theophylact, Jerome, Olshausen [Alford, Wordsworth], refer this to Christ; others take it in a more general sense.* But the bearing of the whole passage implies that Christ is the spiritual Rock upon which to build the house. Here it is true more *implicite* than *explicite*.

The sand.—According to Olshausen, human opinions; but more properly, according to the connection, all that which is transitory—the teaching and works of man.

The winds.—Bengel: temptations; Meyer: the *dolores Messiæ*. We take it more generally, as the trials intervening between this and the judgment.

It fell not.—Implying not merely life, but triumph; just as the falling involves not merely ἀπώλεια, but the shame of being rejected.†

Vers. 28 and 29. *Conclusion of the narrative.*—

Ἦν διδάσκων.—The verb εἶναι is added to the participle by way of increasing its force. It frequently denotes duration, continuance: **He was teaching.**

As having authority, viz., to teach; referring not merely to human authority, nor to capacity (Fritzsche: *docendi copia*), nor even to Divine mission, but to the full power of the word which is at the same time the full authority of the word.

Οἱ γραμματεῖς.—Some codd. add. αὐτῶν. Another reading, still less approved, adds, οἱ φαρισαῖοι. Not that the scribes appeared, in comparison with Jesus, "as having arrogated to themselves the office of teacher" (de Wette); but as wanting the seal of the Spirit, and hence of their Divine mission and authority.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The Messianic character and claims of Christ appear repeatedly throughout the Sermon on the Mount. Not that He overstepped the landmarks of His historical progress by asserting His dignity in so many words, but that the authority of His teaching and person must have been felt by all. Even the beatitudes would show that He who uttered them was a Divine personage. In ch. v. 11, Christ calls them blessed who are persecuted for His name—an expression which is explained in ver. 10 as equivalent to suffering for *righteousness'* sake. His Divine authority further appears when He designates His disciples the salt of the earth and the light of the world, and still more in the declaration that He came to fulfil the law (v. 17). In the course of His sermon, He claims the right both of interpreting the law, and of enjoining its obligations upon His disciples: "But *I* say unto you." His Divine authority appears still further in the denunciation of the representatives of a spurious and carnal worship. All His admonitions imply the existence of a contrast between men, whose nature is evil, and Himself, who is the Holy One. Finally, His Messianic dignity and office are clearly brought out in the concluding part, vers. 21–23. The people, also, gradually seem to have been more fully impressed with the fact that He was sent from on high, and that all power and authority were committed to Him; although, as yet, the feeling may to a considerable extent have been vague and ill defined.

2. Christ conveys a twofold assurance of the safety of the way on which He would have us enter. He not only gives His own full and personal guarantee, but He illustrates and enforces what He recommends by grounds derived from life, from nature, and from experience. Among them, He adduces, 1. the success of earnest human endeavors (ver. 8); 2. the affectionate care of earthly parents, although themselves evil (ver. 9; comp. also Isa. xlix. 15; Eph. iii. 14); 3. the moral duty implied in the ordinary demands which we make upon our neighbors (ver. 12); 4. the contrast between the highway along which the multitude travels, and the narrow path on which the elect walk (ver. 13); 5. the natural law, according to which the fruits correspond to the tree, and the contrast between good and bad trees (ver. 16); 6. the right and proper disposition of things: the evil tree is cast into the fire (ver. 19); 7. the teaching of experience, as illustrated by the house reared upon the rock, and that erected upon a foundation of sand (ver. 24).

* [D. Brown: "the rock of true discipleship, or genuine subjection to Christ."—]

† [D. Brown: "How lively must this imagery have been to an audience accustomed to the fierceness of an Eastern tempest, and the suddenness and completeness with which it sweeps everything unsteady before it!" Chrysostom: "The *rain* descended, etc. A prophecy verified in the primitive church, bearing all the brunt of the waves and storms of the world, of people, of tyrants, of friends, of strangers, of the devil himself persecuting her, and venting all the hurricane of his rage upon her. She stood firm, because she was built upon a rock. So far from being injured, she was made more glorious by the assault."—P. S.]

3. The following are the leading characteristics of the way of salvation: I. *In reference to what we are to seek*,—(*a*) Religious aspirations: asking, seeking, knocking (the evidence of true asking is, that it is followed by seeking, just as knocking is the evidence of seeking. The expression, to *seek*, alludes to the hidden path between the rocks; hence it is said, "Few there be that find it"). (*b*) Moral aspirations springing from inward sincerity and earnestness. (*c*) Actual decision: we are to leave the city of destruction, and to enter that of salvation. This forms a transition, II. *to what we are to avoid:* (1) With reference to that which is without. (*a*) We are not to be carried away by the multitude,—to avoid that which is easy, mere passiveness. (*b*) We are not to be led astray by false prophets. Search and try beyond the outward appearance (not as it may appear at the time, but wait for the autumn and the fruits). (2) With reference to that which is within. (*a*) We are to beware of a dead profession and merely nominal Christianity, which will prove equally discordant with God, with His will, and with Christian duty to our neighbor. (*b*) Above all, we are to beware of confounding enthusiasm or excitement with spiritual life, love to the Saviour, and fellowship with Him. III. *The true test*. The prospect into the future, which at the same time implies an examination into the foundation of our present state: (*a*) Anticipation of the storm which is to burst; (*b*) of the sunshine which is to follow, and to shed its light either upon a ruin, or on a fabric that has stood the tempest; (*c*) anticipation of the revelation of Christ as Judge, by receiving Him into our inmost hearts as the foundation of our faith and life.

4. Heresy; dead orthodoxy, or adherence to the letter; and religious fanaticism without spiritual experience: what an awful climax!

5. True prudence consists in spiritual wisdom. In building our house, we must look forward to the ultimate catastrophe and to eternity. What applies to the individual, is equally true of the community. The simile here used has received its grand fulfilment in the contrast presented between the unbelieving and the believing portion of the synagogue at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem. (Comp. Rom. ix.-xi. *Leben Jesu* ii. 2, 635; iii. 88.)

6. Special remarks.—(1) *As to prayer*. The words of the Lord imply that every prayer will certainly be heard and answered. Of course, this remark only holds true of genuine prayer,—which presupposes, (*a*) a right motive (from God); (*b*) a right spirit (self-surrender); (*c*) a corresponding expression (filialness); (*d*) a right object (our salvation in the glory of God, or the glory of God in our salvation). Heubner: We cannot be absolutely certain that our prayers shall be heard, unless they concern the kingdom of God or our own salvation. For temporal blessings we can only pray conditionally (which will, at any rate, be the case in every genuine prayer); nor is the promise of an answer absolute in such circumstances. Still, we are both permitted and encouraged to make known all our requests; and the more necessary the object is which we seek, the more confidently may we hope for an answer.—The Lord bestows temporal gifts even without our supplication; but spiritual blessings are granted only in answer to prayer. (Comp. the passage in the Apolog. of Tertullian about prayer, as the only kind of violence allowed to Christians,—"*Hæc vis Deo grata est.*")—"It is remarkable that, despite man's sinfulness, such love for their offspring remains in the heart of fathers and mothers. A glorious symbol this of the infinite love of our heavenly Father."—(2) *Rule* for our conduct toward our neighbor—negatively: Do not unto others what you would not have them do unto yourself. (Tobith iv. 16. The sentence of Salvianus to this passage, *see* in Heubner's Com., p. 101.) With this, Kant's celebrated moral principle may be compared: Act in such a manner that your conduct may be capable of being elevated into a maxim applicable to all, or a universal principle. The rule here laid down by the Lord finds an echo in every breast. But it deserves notice, that while others may have expressed it in an imperfect and negative manner, the Saviour alone disclosed it in all its richness and fulness. —(3) The *narrow way* and the *strait gate*, the *broad way* and the *wide gate*. We must not overlook the historical application of this simile; nor yet its general import, as relating to penitence and impenitence, to faith and unbelief, to sanctification and destruction. Heubner: "Oh! how many go on the broad way! Thus the majority of men hasten to ruin, and will ultimately be condemned." But Heubner here combines two very different statements, which are not necessarily connected. Does not grace rescue many a soul from the path of destruction even at the last hour? But, apart from this, it is well to call attention to the awful prospect set before man in this passage. *See* the sentences of Augustine, Luther, and others, on the passage, quoted by Heubner, p. 102.—*Beware*, etc., ver. 15.—The three kinds of false spirits among Christians are here described with marvellous accuracy and delicacy of touch: (1) False prophets, manifestly referring to heretics; (2) false professors; (3) spurious enthusiasts. On the different explanations of *fruits*, *see* Heubner, p. 106.

"As the thorns and thistles must have shown, at first sight, that the tree on which they grew was corrupt, it is evidently a mistake to refer that simile to trees which never bare fruit, or to such as are half decayed, but which, as is well known, ofttimes yield some excellent fruit. Undoubtedly, it must apply to degenerate trees. Accordingly, the expression is significant, and indicates that our Lord acknowledged a gradual depravation of nature corresponding to the progress of moral evil in the world, of which the thorns and thistles are the symbol." (Gen. iii.; *Leben Jesu*, ii. 2, 645.)

In the concluding simile, the contrast between a life of true faith and mere profession is set before us, just as the figure of the twofold building represents, on the one hand, the Church as the great structure reared by Christ, and, on the other, the building raised by the hierarchy.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Directions of the Lord how to seek the kingdom of heaven.—Essential outlines of the way to heaven: 1. Turning to God (to ask, to seek, to knock). 2. Turning away from the world,—(*a*) to give in love, instead of taking in selfishness; (*b*) to deny ourselves; (*c*) not to follow the multitude. We must beware of following the example of the multitude, the teaching of false prophets, the delusions of dead professors, and the deceitfulness of apparent achievements. 3. Rearing our heavenly house upon the Divine Rock.

Ask.—The unconditional promise of answer in every real want, or infinite and prevening love: 1. Expressed in the Divine arrangement: ask—seek—knock; 2. illustrated by a general principle, applicable to temporal as well as spiritual things: "For

every one that asketh," etc.; 3. symbolized and proved by the affection of earthly parents.—Every genuine spiritual aspiration shall be satisfied; "for every one that asketh," etc.—The characteristics of true prayer. It is, 1. genuine asking; and becomes, 2. earnest seeking; and 3. urgent knocking.—Gradual progress in seeking after the kingdom of God. The search becomes,—1. increasingly definite in reference to its object (*a*) the gift of God; (*b*) spiritual treasure; (*c*) the door of heaven; 2. leads to an increased sense of our own poverty and ruin (want; sense of having lost; sense of standing without, of being lost); 3. increasingly urgent in its manifestations; and hence, 4. results in increasing dependence upon God (He must give, disclose, and open).—The love of an earthly father a dim representation of the love of our heavenly Father: (*a*) From its character; (*b*) from the confidence in His disposition which we cherish; (*c*) from our experience of past benefits.—The ruins of true humanity left in our sinful nature, an indication and proof of our Divine origin.—Christ presupposes the corruption of man, 1. to such an extent, as to speak of it only in connection with promises of salvation; 2. so fully, as to except none; 3. so kindly, that He mentions at the same time any features of genuine humanity still left.

Therefore all things (ver. 12)—the law and the prophets, as included in the principle laid down by the Lord: "therefore all things," etc.: 1. Proof of it; 2. inference from it.—This principle, as describing the conduct of Christ Himself (Matt. v. 17, 18); as explaining the nature of true love, Rom. xiii. 10; as both the gift and the requirement of His Spirit.—The claims of others upon us are pled by the voice in our own hearts.—Our demands the measure of our bestowing upon others.

Enter ye in.—Entrance into life rendered difficult: 1. From certain peculiarities which deter: (*a*) The gate is strait; (*b*) the way is narrow; (*c*) difficult to find; (*d*) there are few companions on it. 2. By the attractions of the other road: (*a*) The gate is wide (the principal entrance); (*b*) the way broad (highway); (*c*) many walk on it; and do not merely walk, but intend and expect to go into the city by it (*εἰσερχόμενοι δι' αὐτῆς*).—Marks of the true way.—Marks of the false way.—We are neither to follow the multitude along the highways, nor false prophets into byeways.—Beware of false prophets: 1. *Why?* Because they are *false* prophets, (*a*) in sheep's clothing—very deceptive; (*b*) inwardly, ravening wolves—very destructive. 2. By what marks shall we know them? (*a*) By their fruits. From prophets we expect good fruit, such as figs and grapes; but these yield only the fruits of the wilderness—thorns and thistles. (*b*) From the judgment which quickly overtakes them.—False comfort flowing from trust in a dead profession.—Dead profession is not rendered better by our surrendering the Christian name, but by a spiritual renewal.—Who shall enter into the kingdom of heaven? 1. He only who confesses the Lord; 2. not every one who outwardly confesses Him; 3. he who proves the truth of his profession by a holy obedience.—Life in Christ, the will of the Father concerning us.—It is one thing to do many works *by* the name of Christ, and another to do them *in* the name of Christ.—Even enthusiasm and outward success are not sufficient evidence of our discipleship.—Spurious enthusiasm generally betrays itself by its boastfulness.—Many who appear great in Church and State, will in that day be deprived of their assumed character, and of their claims to respect.—The threefold judgment upon false prophets, dead professors, and zealots and selfish enthusiasts.—The judgment implied in the words, "*I never knew you.*" This means: 1. Ye have never known Me; 2. never known yourselves; 3. and therefore cannot be known of Me.—To know, to love, and to praise, go hand in hand.

The house built upon the rock, and that reared upon the sand.—The rock and the sand; or the Eternal Word in its compactness and firmness, and the world, resembling particles of sand, without cohesion.—Every spiritual structure shall be tried. 1. The truth of this statement: (*a*) As proved by experience; (*b*) even the kingdom of God, or the inner life, has its tempests. 2. Inferences: (*a*) Many a false building has already been swept away; (*b*) how careful should we be in rearing our own structure!—The word of Christ a word of power: 1. Of real power (of truth, of love, of life, of the Spirit); 2. of perfect power (of full authority and omnipotence).—The teaching of the scribes and the teaching of Christ. The former powerless, despite their appearance of power, authority, science, and enthusiasm; the latter all-powerful, in the midst of deepest outward poverty and contempt.

Starke:—Ask: Ps. l. 15; Isa. lv. 6; Ps. xxi. 2, 3; Zech. x. 1; James i. 5. *Seek:* Jer. xxix. 13, 14; Luke xv. 5–9. *Knock:* Luke xiii. 24; Acts xii. 13–16; Rev. iii. 20; Gen. xxxii. 26–29.—Augustine: *Ideo non vult cito dare, ut tu discas ardentius orare.*—He who would show others the way, must himself seek everything from God in prayer: 2 Cor. iii. 5, 6; Acts x. 9.—True prayer is converse with God: Ps. xix. 15.—*Quesnel:* O Lord, we ofttimes ask for the stone of temporal possessions, which would make our heart a stone; but, instead of it, Thou hast given us the bread of Thy grace, of Thy word, and of Thy Son: Prov. xxx. 7.—Foolish children that we are, how often do we regard as a stone what is better for soul and body than the finest bread, and as the poison of serpents, what proves the most blessed medicine for our hearts! Prov. xx. 14.—Every earthly parent may help to remind us of the love and faithfulness of God toward His own: Isa. lxiii. 7, xlix. 15.—Even if it were possible that all earthly parents should forget their duty, yet will God prove a Father: Isa. lxiv. 16.—The affection of parents toward their children, a symbol of the hearing of prayer.—"Therefore, all things whatsoever ye would." *En speculum paratissimum, justitiæ breviarium, compendiosum commonitorium.* Jerome.—Each one of us carries in his breast an adviser, judge, and monitor of his conduct toward his neighbor: Ps. xv. 3; Matt. xxii. 39; Eph. iv. 25: 1 Tim. i. 5; Gal. v. 14; Rom. xiii. 10.—Here you have the test of what you owe to your neighbors—the spring of equity and the bond of mutual forbearance.—Selfishness will always find a ready excuse: 1 Cor. iv. 7; Luke xviii. 11.—*Enter ye in at the strait gate.* There are only two roads which lead to eternity,—that of the world and of the flesh, which leads to hell and condemnation; and that of the Spirit, which leads to heaven and eternal life. Therefore be sure which of these two thou hast chosen.—Strive to enter in at the strait gate: Luke xiii. 24; Phil. ii. 24.—Christians are pilgrims: Ps. xxxix. 14; Heb. xiii. 24.—In its folly, the world hastens along the broad way to hell, to the sound of music and revelry.—The sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory to be revealed: 2 Cor. iv. 17; Rom. viii. 18.—Luther:—It is not the Lord Jesus who makes the road to heaven so

strait and narrow, but rather the devil, the world, and our own flesh: ch. xix. 21, 22; Prov. xxvi. 13.—Why is it that so few find the way to heaven? Because of their negligence in seeking, their sloth in striving, their daring in resisting God, and their malice in sinning. Hence their condemnation rests upon their own heads: 2 Pet. i. 8; Acts xiv. 16; John viii. 12; Acts xiv. 22; Rev. viii. 14.—Let us not be offended at the small number of believers, Isa. i. 8; Zeph. iii. 12; nor at their many afflictions; but comfort ourselves in view of their blessed end, Zeph. iii. 17; Rev. iii. 20.—*Beware*—Phil. iii. 18; 1 John iv. 1—*of false prophets*, Jer. xiv. 14; xxiii. 26; Mic. iii. 5–12; Zeph. iii. 4; 2 Pet. ii. 1; Rev. xvi. 13.—*Sheep's clothing*, John x. 5; 2 Cor. xi. 13–15; Jer. xxiii. 21.—*Ravening wolves*, John x. 8–12; Acts xx. 29; 2 Tim. ii. 17, 18; Ezek. xxi. 29; Matt. x. 16; 2 Cor. xi. 13, 14.—*Quœnam sunt istæ pelles ovium, nisi nominis Christiani extrinsecus facies?* (Tertullian.)—*Hæretici sunt habitu oves, astu vulpes, actu et crudelitate lupi.* (Bernhard.)—Trust not every spirit, nor every talker or seducer.—To speak like an angel, to pamper the flesh, to gain the simple by outward devotion, by authority, by age, by tears or groans, to give one's body to be burned, to do miracles,—are not the signs of a true prophet: the worst deceivers have exhibited all these, ch. xxiv. 4–11; 2 Thess. ii. 9, 10.—Sound doctrine and the fruits of sanctification the evidence of a true prophet: 2 Tim. iv. 3, 4; Ezek. xiii. 18; Jer. xxiii. 25, 26, 32; Hos. xii. 1.—*Majus*:—Every Christian should try the spirits, and recognize the truth: Acts xvii. 11, the men of Berea.—All who lead us astray from the narrow way are false teachers, Jer. v. 31; Hos. xi. 1, 2.—Let no one imagine that there is any Church entirely free from heretics, sectarians, or false teachers.—*By their fruits. Luther*:—As if He would say,—The appearance of false prophets may be fair, as if it were a precious thing; but wait a while, until it is time to gather and to collect the fruits, and see what you will then find upon them.—Behold the goodness and the severity of God in the fruits of the earth. By reason of sin it bears thorns and thistles, but it also brings grapes and figs.—False teachers are like thorns and thistles. Their teaching affords no consolation, and only wounds the heart and conscience. Song. v. 7.—The marks of false teachers appear in the way they administer their office, in their doctrine, life, and conversation, in their motives, and in the conduct of their disciples, John xv. 20. *Zeisius*.—The hireling and the false prophet.—It is the duty of Christians to prove all things, and to hold fast the word of God, 1 Thess. v. 21; Ex. xviii. 15.—*Quesnel*: Love, or rather faith, is the root of the good tree. So long as this root remains healthy, the tree will not yield the corrupt fruit of sin; but if it is awanting, you will in vain look for the fruits of righteousness, 1 Tim. i. 5.—*Majus*: A wicked person may be transformed into a righteous; but, so long as he remains wicked, he cannot do anything that is good, Matt. xii. 34; Philem. 11, 12.—*Every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit.* John xv. 2–6; 2 Tim. iii. 9; Isa. viii. 20; Rev. xix. 20; Gal. v. 12; Matt. xiii. 30; Ps. cix. 2.—*Not every one who saith.* 1 John v. 12; 1 Thess. iv. 3; 1 Pet. i. 15; Matt. v. 19; John iv. 23; Rom. ii. 13; James i. 22; John iii. 16–36.—*Quesnel*: To call God our Lord, and yet not to honor Him by our works, is to condemn ourselves, 2 Cor. v. 15; Luke x. 28.—Much knowledge, without corresponding practice, entails the heavier judgment; do what thou knowest. *Hedinger*. John xv. 14.—False Christianity makes its boast in words, in knowledge, and appearance—ch. xxiii. 27; 2 Tim. iii. 5,—but true religion consists in deed, and is spirit and life. The former may be likened to a painted figure; the latter, to a living man, ch. v. 16.—*Many will say to Me in that day.* Matt. xxiv. 36; 1 Cor. xiii. 1, 2; Phil. i. 15; Acts xix. 13; 1 Cor. xi. 13; 2 Thess. ii. 9; Rev. xiii. 13.—So deeply rooted is false conceit in our minds, that even in the day of judgment men will not be able to comprehend how they incurred condemnation, ch. xxv. 44.—*Quesnel*: How many preachers are there, who in the pulpit seem to be prophets; and how many ministers whose success is admired, but who, in the sight of God, are nothing, because they neglect His will! Luke xiii. 26.—*Then will I profess unto them*,—openly on that day. John x. 14; 2 Tim. ii. 19; 1 Cor. viii. 3; Matt. xxv. 12; John x. 27; Ps. i. 6.—*Dei agnoscere servare est; Dei agnoscere custodire est; non agnoscere damnare est.* Augustine.—The grace of God saves a soul, and not gifts.—*Therefore, whosoever heareth these sayings of Mine*, etc. John iii. 17.—The Rock is Christ; Matt. xvi. 18; 1 Cor. iii. 11; x. 4; Jer. xvii. 7; Ps. cxviii. 22; Isa. xxviii. 16; Acts iv. 11, 12; Rom. ix. 33; 1 Pet. ii. 5–7.—To build on Him, is to believe on Him.—At the close of a sermon, we should admonish our hearers to obedience and earnest application of the word.—*Quesnel*: To employ ourselves in this building, is to be truly wise, Isa. lviii. 11, 12.—The wisdom of the just appears in their showing their faith by their works.—*And the rain descended.* Ps. cxxiv. 5; xviii. 5; Rev. xii. 15; Jer. li. 1; Eph. iv. 14; Ps. xlvi. 6; Isa. xxv. 4; xxxii. 2; Rom. viii. 33.—*Quesnel*:—By the practice of piety do we make our calling and election sure, 2. Pet. i. 10; 1 Tim. iv. 7, 8.—*Cramer*: True Christians are exposed to many a tempest and storm, but we are more than conquerors through Him who loved us.—Perseverance to the end the crowning manifestation of faithful allegiance to Christ, 2 Tim. iv. 7, 8; Rev. ii. 10.—*And doeth them not.* James i. 22–24.—*Majus*: Hypocrisy bears to the world the aspect of a great building, but it has no foundation, and will fall, Luke xviii. 11–14.—*And the rain descended*; i. e., adversity and strong temptations befell him, Ps. xxxii. 6; Prov. xvi. 4. Under such trials a merely external Christianity speedily fails.—This refers to the final judgment, when body and soul shall be destroyed in hell, Gen. vii. 21; Ex. xiv. 27, 28; Job viii. 14; Ps. i. 5; xxxiv. 22; lxxiii. 19.—*Quesnel*: That fall cannot be repaired again.

Heubner:—*Ask* grace and the forgiveness of sin. *Seek*, earnestly aim after, perfection. *Knock* at the door of heaven, and it shall be opened.—Whatever is needful for our salvation shall be granted in answer to our prayers.—Ask in a childlike spirit for what you may stand in as absolute need of, as of bread, and God will give it you.—"Therefore, all things whatsoever," etc. In your dealings, put yourself mentally in the place of your neighbor.—The strait gate: true repentance.—"Strait" refers to the anxiety of the heart in the matter.—The wide gate: impenitence.—Appearances deceive.—Beware of mere appearance.—Neither good works alone, nor sound doctrine alone, constitutes good fruits; the latter are the results of both life and doctrine.—A good tree is that which has been ennobled, and refers to a regenerate man; a corrupt tree is that which has degenerated, and means the unrenewed or natural man.—The culture of grace alone can ennoble a man.—A corrupt tree has no place in the garden of God.—"Not

every one that saith, Lord, Lord."—The most splendid talents are oftentimes combined with a wicked heart; the most splendid deeds are ofttimes of dubious value. A man may be the most enthusiastic speaker, the opponent of every injustice and wrong, and the bold champion of all that is good and noble, —yet all from selfishness and unworthy ambition.—Each sin renders a man more untrue to himself.—The future judgment will consist in the manifestation of the secrets of our hearts. Then the game is up, and it will be said: Off with the masks. This applies especially to unworthy ministers.

The pericope, vers. 15-23.—Warning of the Lord against byeways which lead to destruction: 1. Warning against being led astray by others—by false prophets, *i. e.*, either by false teachers, or by any who would seduce us from the truth; 2. against being led astray by our own hearts, by hypocrisy, and mere profession.—Fourfold form of the call of the Lord: (*a*) As a Divine call; (*b*) as the utterance of Divine truth; (*c*) as that of the pure and holy heart; (*d*) as that of His love and concern for the souls of men.

The pericope, vers. 15-23. *Erdmann:*—Concerning the true import of human works.—*Dräseke:* The desire to appear good: 1. Its nature; 2. its origin; 3. its moral character; 4. its unavoidable dangers.—*Reinhard:*—On the only certain mark of a state pleasing to God. It consists not, 1. in outward decency; nor, 2. in a public profession of the Gospel; nor, 3. in personal attachment to Jesus (?); nor, 4. in extraordinary works (?); but, 5. in faith in Jesus, and in an endeavor to attain holiness by that faith,—our aim being directed toward the reality, rather than the outward form.—*Marheineke:*—How do we prove ourselves to be true professors of Christ? 1. Not by outward appearances merely, but by the power and life of faith; 2. by works of love; 3. by joy, peace, and hope. *Nitzsch:*—The true value of good works (Selections of Sermons i., p. 12). *Zimmermann:*—The tree an image of man (root, stem, marrow, branches, leaves, blossoms, fruit). *Fr. Krummacher:*—Who enters into the kingdom of heaven (Voices of the Church, Langenberg, 1852, p. 49). Sermons on Ver. 15, by Rautenberg, Souchon, Ahlfeld. *Höpfner:*—Four things necessary to constitute a Christian: 1. Faith *makes* a Christian; 2. life *proves* a Christian; 3. trials *confirm* a Christian; 4. death *crowns* a Christian.

B. CHRIST MANIFESTING HIS PROPHETIC OFFICE BY MIRACLES WHICH ATTEST HIS WORD. BUT IN HIS MIRACLES, AS IN HIS TEACHING, HE EXPERIENCES THE CONTRADICTION OF THE PHARISEES, AND IS ULTIMATELY REVILED. TRIUMPH OF CHRIST OVER THE OPPOSITION OF HIS ENEMIES, BY PREPARING TO SEND FORTH HIS TWELVE APOSTLES.—CH. VIII. IX.

CONTENTS:—The miracles of the Lord, as the evidence of His prophetic office, misunderstood and reviled by the Pharisees and Sadducees. 1. Miracles of the Lord beyond the pale of the ancient theocracy: the leper and the heathen. 2. Miracles of the Lord proceeding from the circle of the new theocracy (the house of Peter): the mother-in-law of Peter, those who were possessed of evil spirits. 3. Miracles during His missionary journey: the disciples, the storm at sea. 4. Miraculous works, despite the opposition of the kingdom of darkness: the Gadarenes, the man afflicted with the palsy. 5. Miraculous works, despite the contradiction of legalism: Matthew Levi the publican, the feast with the publicans, and the twofold offence of the Pharisees and the disciples of John. 6. Miraculous works in the face of utter despair and of death: the woman with the issue of blood, and the daughter of Jairus. 7. Miraculous works of Christ as the dawn of His work of redemption, in opposition to the hardening and the reviling of His enemies: the two blind men, and the person possessed with a dumb devil. 8. Royal preparation for the mission of Christ's disciples, and triumph over those who reviled His prophetic office.

I.

The *leper*, and the *heathen*, or the centurion of Capernaum. *Miraculous works of Christ beyond the pale of the ancient theocracy.*

CHAPTER VIII. 1-13.

(*The Gospel for the 3d Sunday after Epiphany.*—Parallels:—The Leper: Mark i. 40-45; Luke v. 12-16. The Centurion of Capernaum: Luke vii. 1-10.)

1 When he was [had] come down from the mountain, great multitudes followed him.
2 And, behold, there came a leper and worshipped him, saying, Lord, if thou wilt, thou
3 canst make me clean. And Jesus [he][1] put forth *his* hand, and touched him, saying, I
4 will; be thou clean. And immediately his leprosy was cleansed. And Jesus saith

unto him, See thou tell no man; but go thy way, shew thyself to the priest, and offer
the gift that Moses commanded, for a testimony unto them.
5 And when Jesus [he] was [had] entered into Capernaum, there came unto him a
6 centurion, beseeching him, And saying, Lord, my servant lieth at home sick of the
7 palsy, grievously tormented. And Jesus saith unto him, I will come and heal him.
8 The centurion answered and said, Lord, I am not worthy that thou shouldest come
under my roof: but speak the word only [only say in a word],[2] and my servant shall
9 be healed. For I am a man under authority, having soldiers under me: and I say to
this *man*, Go, and he goeth; and to another, Come, and he cometh; and to my ser-
10 vant, Do this, and he doeth *it*. When Jesus heard *it*, he marvelled, and said to them
that followed, Verily I say unto you, I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel.[3]
11 And I say unto you, That many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down
[recline at table][4] with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven:
12 But the children of the kingdom shall be cast out into [the] outer darkness: there shall
13 be weeping and gnashing of teeth. And Jesus said unto the centurion, Go thy way;
and as thou hast believed, *so* be it done unto thee. And his servant was healed in the
selfsame hour.

[1] Ver. 8.—'Ιησοῦς is wanting in Codd. B., C. [Cod. Sinait.], etc.

[2] Ver. 8.—Λόγῳ (dat.) *with one word*, or *in a word*, sustained by Codd. B., C. [Cod. Sinait.] and other weighty testimonies, instead of the λόγον (accus.), *the word*, of the *text. receptus*.

[3] Ver. 10.—"*With no one in Israel.*" Cod. B. and others.

[4] Ver. 11.—['Ανακλιθήσονται, expressing the well known ancient custom of *reclining* on couches at meals and banquets. This explains, how St. John could *lean on Jesus' bosom* at the holy supper, John xiii. 23.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1. **When He was come down** (*cum autem descendisset.* Vulg.).—*Chronological arrangement of the narrative.* We account for the circumstance, that Luke records the healing of the leper (v. 12) before the Sermon on the Mount (vi. 20), on the ground that he wished to relate the latter in connection with the mission of the twelve Apostles. Hence, his arrangement is not in strict chronological order. Besides, the introduction of the cure of the leper in Luke breaks up the continuous narrative of the return of Jesus from the Mount of Beatitudes to Capernaum. Matthew expressly states, that the cure of the leper was performed when Christ "*had come down*" from the mountain. On the other hand, Luke relates, that Christ, on His journey to Capernaum, entered into a city; and that the cure of the leper there was the occasion of His retiring for a time into the wilderness, probably in consideration of the prejudices of the Jews, as the leprous person had, contrary to the injunction of the Saviour, published the fact, that Jesus had touched, and so healed him. After this temporary retirement to the wilderness, Jesus returned to Capernaum.

Ver. 2. **A leper.**—(Comp. on the general subject of *leprosy* Michaelis: *Mosaisches Recht*, vol. iv. p. 227, Winer *sub voce*, and Ewald: *Jüdische Alterthümer*, p. 218.) **Leprosy,** צָרַעַת, λέπρα, as to its *general character*, is a disease peculiar to Egypt, Arabia, Palestine, and Syria, although it has penetrated as far east as Persia and India, and as far west as Italy. A most frightful calamity, resembling in some respects the pestilence; only that the latter sweeps away its victims with great rapidity, while leprosy is slow in its ravages. These two diseases formed, so to speak, the centre of all others, such as blindness, palsy, deafness, fevers, bloody flux, etc. Analogous to these physical sufferings were the various kinds of demoniacal possessions.—*Causes.* Leprosy is caused by bad air, want of cleanliness, bad diet, dyspepsia, infection (especially by cohabitation), or a hereditary taint. It sometimes continues to the fourth generation (2 Sam. iii. 29), but the disease loses in intensity as it descends, and is generally confined in the fourth degree to ugly teeth, offensive breath, and sickly appearance.—*Kinds* and *degrees*. Leprosy is a form of skin disease. Four kinds of it were known—elephantiasis (an Egyptian disease, hence, *ulcus Ægypti*), black leprosy, white leprosy, and red leprosy. Hippocrates classified the different kinds of non-malignant eruptions as ἀλφός, λειχήν, λεύκη, and λεπραί. The first of these is the בֹּהַק of Lev. xiii. 39, which is quite harmless in its character, and disappears, without causing any pain, in a few months or years. We also read, in Lev. xiii. 47, of a leprosy attaching to clothes (probably from small insects); and in xiv. 34, of one attaching to houses. The symptoms of white leprosy, *Barras*, also known as *lepra Mosaica*,—the form of the disease peculiar to the Hebrews,—are sufficiently described in Lev. xiii. When the disease is decided in its character, it is either rapidly cured, or else spreads inward. In the former case, there is a violent eruption, so that the patient is white from head to foot (Lev. xiii. 12; 2 Kings v. 27); in the latter case, the disease progresses slowly, and the symptoms are equally distressing and fatal, ending in consumption, dropsy, suffocation, and death. The effects of elephantiasis are even more sad. It chiefly affects the lower part of the body, and the patient may live for twenty years. It stiffens the ankle (making the foot like that of an elephant, hence the name), stupefies the senses, produces melancholy, sleeplessness, terrible dreams (Job vii. 14), insatiable voracity, and ends in fever or sudden suffocation.—*Legislation* on leprosy. The Mosaic law took special notice of leprosy. The priests were commissioned carefully to watch its inroads. The object in view was to protect the healthy portion of the community, to pronounce on the harmless character of any eruption which resembled leprosy, and to readmit into the community those who had been cured. No remedy was known for the disease itself: the leper was de-

clared unclean, and excluded from intercourse with all other persons. He had to wear the prescribed mourning garment, Lev. xiii. 45, but was permitted to associate with other lepers. Their abodes were commonly outside the city walls (Lev. xiii. 46; Num. v. 2); but they were allowed to go about freely, providing they avoided contact with other persons; nor were they even excluded from the services of the synagogue (Lightfoot, 862). In this respect we note a great difference between the synagogue and the temple. On recovering from leprosy, several lustrations had to be performed, Lev. xiv. The main points in the prescribed rite were, to appear before the priest, and to offer a sacrifice; the latter being preceded by religious lustrations, and introduced by a symbolical ceremony, in which the two turtles or pigeons bore a striking analogy to the scape-goat and the other goat offered in sacrifice on the day of atonement, Lev. xvi.—In general, the ordinances connected with leprosy may be regarded as the type of all other directions in dealing with that which was unclean.—*Symbolical significance.* Accordingly, leprosy was regarded as the symbol of *sin* and of *judgment* (Num. xii. 10; 2 Kings v. 26; xv. 5; 2 Chron. xxvi. 20, 21-23); also of inscrutable visitations, Job ii. 7. On the other hand, *recovery* from leprosy was regarded as a symbol of *salvation*, as in the case of Naaman, 2 Kings v. 2; comp. Ps. li. 9, with Lev. vi. 7. The uncleanness, the gradual destruction of the system, the disgusting appearance, and the unexpected recovery by a full outbreak of the eruption,—and, again, the slow but sure progress of the disease, the isolation of those who were affected by it from the society of the clean, the infectious nature of the trouble, its long duration and hopelessness,—presented a variety of views under which sin and guilt with its consequences and effects, even upon innocent individuals, might be symbolized.

Ver. 2. **And worshipped Him**—fell down before Him (on his face). "As in ch. ii. 2; xv. 25, a sign of profound reverence. The leper regarded Jesus at least as a great prophet, though it is difficult accurately to define the measure of knowledge possessed by such believers (comp. vers. 8-10). Hence the import of this worship, and of the designation, 'Lord,' differed under various circumstances. Some regarded even the promised Messiah as a mere man (?), while others were fully aware of His Divine character." Gerlach.

Ver. 3. **His leprosy was cleansed,** ἐκαθαρίσθη.—By his being brought into contact with Him who was absolute purity.

Ver. 4. **Tell no man:** Mark i. 44; Luke v. 14; comp. Matt. ix. 30; xii. 16; Mark iii. 12; v. 43; vii. 36; viii. 26-30; Matt. xvi. 20; xvii. 9.—The injunction of silence upon the persons cured arose, in all instances, from the same general motives. It was primarily dictated by a regard for the spiritual and physical welfare of such persons. Besides, to prevent popular excitement, and not to endanger the ministry of Christ, it was better to keep silence on these matters. But, in each special case, there was also a particular motive. Maldonatus, Grotius, Bengel, and others, suppose that, in the present instance, it was enjoined in order that no prejudice might be raised in the mind of the officiating priest against this recovery. Fritzsche and Baumgarten-Crusius hold that it indicated that the first duty of the leper was to show himself to the priest, before proclaiming abroad the miracle. Olshausen: Jesus issued this injunction mainly to persons who were in danger of being carried away; while in other cases, especially where the individual was by nature retiring and prone to self-contemplation, He commanded an opposite course, Mark v. 19. But the principal motive, as mentioned by Meyer (following Chrysostom), was, that Jesus wished to prevent a concourse of the people, and enthusiastic outbursts on their part. This, however, is not incompatible with any of the other motives; as, in the present instance, the person cured had to undertake a journey to the temple at Jerusalem (Fritzsche, Baumgarten-Crusius, Meyer). According to Maimonides, a person restored from leprosy had, in the first instance, to submit himself to the inspection of the priest of his district. He then underwent a second inspection after the lapse of seven days, after which he performed the customary lustration; and then journeyed to Jerusalem, where he offered the prescribed sacrifice, and was pronounced clean.

Ver. 4. **Show thyself to the priest.**—Comp. the ordinances of purification in Lev. xiv.

For a testimony unto them.—Meyer: *i. e.*, "unto the people, that thou art healed." But we must not overlook the fact, that the leper had been declared unclean by the priests who were now to certify to his restoration, and that his showing himself was the evidence of this. The remark, "for a testimony that I do not destroy the law" (Chrysostom), is inapt; as also the view of Olshausen, that the testimony here referred to was that of the priests.

Ver. 5. Ἑκατόνταρχος, *centurio*, a captain over 100, in the service of Herod Antipas.—According to ver. 10, a Gentile, although in all probability a proselyte of the gate. Comp. the intercession of the ruler of the synagogue on his behalf, in the Gospel according to Luke.—*Proselytes*, גֵּרִים, προσήλυτοι, Sept. 1 Chron. xxii. 2; Matt. xxiii. 15; Acts ii. 10;—those Gentiles who adopted Judaism in a more or less restricted sense (Suidas: ἐξ ἐθνῶν προσεληλυθότες). According to the Gemara and the Rabbins, we distinguish,—I. *Proselytes of the gate*, גֵּרֵי הַשַּׁעַר; *i. e.*, strangers who lived within the gates of Israel, had adopted the religion of the patriarchs, and conformed to what were called the seven Noachic commandments, which prohibited, (*a*) blasphemy; (*b*) the worship of the heavenly bodies, or idolatry; (*c*) murder; (*d*) incest; (*e*) robbery; (*f*) rebellion; (*g*) eating of blood and of things strangled (Acts xv. 20). They were also called οἱ σεβόμενοι (τὸν Θεόν), Joseph. *Antiq.* xiv. 7, 2; Acts xiii. 43, 50; xvi. 14; xvii. 4, etc.—Instances: Cornelius, Lydia, the Ethiopian eunuch, etc. II. *Proselytes of righteousness*, גֵּרֵי הַצֶּדֶק, who had submitted to circumcision, and thus become naturalized Jews. The distinction between these two classes was kept up at the time of Christ; when, indeed, the number of proselytes of the gate had greatly increased.—The two parallel cases of the centurion at the cross (Matt. xxvii. 54) and of Cornelius (Acts x.), will at once occur to the reader.

Ver. 6. **My servant,** ὁ παῖς μου.—The slave, or domestic servant, as distinguished from the common soldier, who was only officially subject to him; but not a son (Strauss, Baumgarten-Crusius). From the more detailed narrative in Luke, we learn that he was held in special esteem by his master; which, indeed, may be gathered from this passage also. The servant is distinguished from the soldiers. The latter come and go as it were mechanically, according to the word of command; while the servant doeth as he is told—his master can intrust to his care the busi-

ness in hand. Evidently the centurion had only this one servant (ver. 9).

Sick of the palsy, παραλυτικός.*—There is a manifest analogy between the sick of the palsy and the demoniacs. The latter were deprived of their consciousness, or of the organ of the soul; while the paralytics were deprived of the use of their bodily organs. Those afflicted with epilepsy formed a kind of intermediate link between these two ailments, being occasionally deprived of the use both of their mental and bodily capacities, and, at other times, of either the one or the other. The παραλυτικοί are as it were physically dissolved (παραλελυμένοι), and prostrated on beds (Matt. ix. 2; Mark iii. 3, etc.). Luther translates *gichtbrüchig*, which signifies only a particular kind of the general disease of paralysis. "Modern physicians apply the term *paralysis* to the loss of voluntary motion, or of sensation in some part of the body, the muscles being entirely relaxed. This constitutes the difference between paralysis and *catalepsis* and the various kinds of *tetanus*, in which the muscles are excited and rigid. In paralysis, the circulation of the blood, animal heat, and the ordinary secretions continue. The disease frequently comes on suddenly (after a stroke of apoplexy), at other times slowly and insensibly, but in every instance is difficult to remove." Winer.

Ver. 9. **For I am a man** ὑπὸ ἐξουσίαν,—**in service.**—Meyer: "He adduces a twofold analogy: the obedience which he is bound to give, and that which he claims from his subordinates." But the former cannot have been meant, as it would imply that Christ was also a subordinate in spiritual matters. The conclusion is, however, not simply *a minori ad majus*, in the sense that Christ ruled in spiritual, as the centurion in temporal matters; but also in this sense, that if he, a subordinate, could issue his commands, much more could Christ, the absolute Lord. Various opinions are entertained about the meaning which the centurion attached to the supremacy of Christ. Fritzsche understands it as applying to His sovereignty over the *demons* as the supposed authors of diseases; Wetstein, Olshausen, and Ewald, over *angels*; Baumgarten-Crusius, over *ministering spirits*; Meyer, over *diseases*, as subject to Christ. But the centurion must have referred to sway over subordinate personages, and not merely over diseases; nor could it here refer to demons, as his servant was not possessed by them. On the other hand, we can readily conceive how a Roman, who was just passing from heathenism to Judaism, would easily confound his Roman notions about *genii* with the idea of angels. Bengel: "*sapientia fidelis ex ruditate militari pulchre elucens.*" What gives such charm to the illustration is, that the centurion ever again recurs to his poor faithful servant. Some familiar servant of the Lord Jesus, he thinks, would suffice to restore his poor slave.—There was no need, he meant to say, for His personal attendance, since even he was not required always personally to superintend the execution of his orders. "Humility and faith always go hand in hand." Meyer.

Ver. 11. **From the east and west.**—Referring not only to Gentiles, but to the more distant of them, without distinction of nationality, Isa. xlv. 6.—**And shall sit down,** or rather recline at table, according to Oriental fashion.—In the minds of the prophets, a symbolical meaning attached to this feast of Messiah, as portraying the blessedness enjoyed in the kingdom of heaven (Isa. xxv. 6). In this sense Jesus here employs the simile, which He afterward expands, as in Luke xiv. 7; Matt. xxii. 1; xxvi. 29. No doubt those around Him would understand the term in this manner. Meyer remarks: "According to Jewish notions, splendid banquets with the patriarchs formed part of the happiness enjoyed in Messiah's kingdom. *See* Berthold, *Christologie*, p. 196, and Schöttgen, *Hor. ad loc.* The expression is employed in a figurative sense by the Lord (although His Jewish hearers would probably understand it literally)." This last clause is somewhat doubtful, as it would scarcely reflect favorably upon the wisdom of Christ. Meyer very properly calls attention to the contrast between this promise of Jesus and the pride of the Jews, as expressed in the following rabbinical saying: "*In mundo futuro* (*dixit Deus*) *mensam ingentem vobis sternam, quod Gentiles videbunt et pudefient.*" Schöttgen, *Hor.*

Ver. 12. **But the children of the kingdom.**—The Jews were children of the typical kingdom, or of the theocracy, and might cherish the expectation of becoming sons of the real kingdom—that of heaven (Rom. ix. 5; xi. 16). The expression, *kingdom*, must here be taken generally, as embracing both economies—the promise and the possession. The term υἱός, בֵּן, indicates relationship either in a physical or moral sense. In the present instance, it refers to the heirs which belong to the kingdom, as well as to those to whom the kingdom belongs.

Outer darkness, τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐξώτερον.—The banqueting hall is lit up, the feast is served in the evening, and outside is utter darkness. So Judas went from the supper of the Lord into the dark night, John xiii. 30. The expression is here used in a comparative sense. They are cast out into *deeper*, nay, into *uttermost* darkness. Just as the feast refers to salvation and bliss at the coming of the Lord, so this picture of night, to the darkness and the horrors of judgment. Hence the description of their sufferings, ὁ κλαυθμός. "The article [which is omitted in the English C. V.] indicates that it is the well-known wretchedness experienced in hell; comp. xiii. 42, 50; xxii. 13; xxiv. 51; xxv. 30; Luke xiii. 28."

Ver. 13. **In the self-same hour.**—Emphatically—as soon as Jesus had spoken the word: comp. John iv. 46. In this case, as in John iv., and in the cure of the daughter of the Syrophœnician woman, the miracle was performed by the Lord at a distance from the subject of it. Several critics (Semler, Seiffarth, Strauss, Weisse, Gfrörer, Baumgarten-Crusius, Baur) have confounded the history of the centurion of Capernaum with that of the royal courtier there (John iv. 46). But this were completely to mistake the different characters of these two persons, and their marked moral peculiarities, as brought out in the Gospels. The courtier was weak in the faith, while the centurion was strong; the courtier deemed the presence of Christ absolutely necessary, and urged Him to come down to his house, while the centurion regarded the word of command sufficient. Hence the difference of treatment on the part of the Lord. (Comp. Lange's *Leben Jesu*, ii. 2, p. 645.)

* [The English *palsy* is evidently derived by contraction from the Greek παράλυσις, as *alms* from ἐλεημοσύνη, through the medium of the Latin.—P. S.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *The miracle.*—The Lord confirmed and sealed His ministry and prophetic office by miracles. The miracle of His person is revealed in His miraculous works. It is evident that the Evangelist here groups together various miracles of the Lord, in order thereby to exhibit Him as the Wonder-worker.

On the conception of miracles consult the works on the Evidences of Christianity, and the Systems of Biblical and Systematic Theology; my *Life of Jesus*, ii. 1, 258; my *Philos. Dogmatics*, 467; Jul. Müller's dissertation: *De miraculorum Jesu Christi natura*, i., Marburg, 1839; ii., Halle, 1841; and other works quoted by Meyer, p. 176.*

In the most general sense of the term, every manifestation of God is a miracle; and He *does wonders*, because He *is wonderful*. As the self-existent One, all His works are *miraculous*, whether in creation or in providence: *i. e.*, He manifests Himself as the Almighty Creator, both in calling forth and forming *that which is not*, and in destroying, or rather transforming, *that which is*. His wondrous deeds are described in Ps. xxxiii. 9 (Ps. cxlviii. 5; cxv. 3);—"He speaks, and it is done; He commands, and it stands fast;" and again, in Rom. iv. 17: "Who quickeneth the dead, and calleth those things that be not as though they were."—*All creation* is a wonder, Ps. cxxxvi. 4; Isa. xl. 26. *All His administration* is wonderful, Ps. lxxxix. 6; Job v. 9, etc. *His judgments for the deliverance of His people* are wonders, Ex. xv. 6; Ps. lxxvii. 15; ix. 2. So are *His leadings of Israel*, Ps. cv. 2 sqq. Such also is *His advent as Saviour*, Ps. xcviii.—We have already adverted to the second or inner circle of wonders, within the first, or more general. In the ordinary course of nature and of history, God performs *special miracles*, for the purpose of *restoring*, of *judging*, and of *delivering*, Ex. xxxiv. 10; Ps. cv. 5; Isa. xxv. 1; Dan. vi. 27; Acts ii. 19. But these new miracles are intimately connected with His general marvellous dealings. As the Almighty and the Creator, He performs the more general miracles of His power. But His special miracles are the manifestation of those new and higher principles which break through and overstep the sphere of common life, and introduce a new and higher order of things, or, in other words, the kingdom of God. These higher miracles appear alongside of His word. Hence we distinguish in this respect between miracles of the *word* (predictions, prophecies) and miracles of *deed* (Isa. xliv. 7; comp. ver. 26, etc.). The miracles of deed confirm those of the word, and distinguish them from the delusive predictions of false prophets. Similarly, however, the miracles of the word confirm those of deed, and distinguish them from the tokens of magicians.—Under the New Covenant, the distinction between miracles of word and deed merges in the *person of Christ*. He is *the Wonderful* (Isa. ix. 6),—the personal, the highest, the absolute Wonder,—because He is the absolute Principle of all Life manifested, *the Word itself in outward deed*, or God incarnate. As the *absolute Wonder*, and the Principle of that new and spiritual era which is destined to subdue and transform every relationship of the past, He cannot but perform miracles,—nay, all His doings are miraculous. Himself the new Creation, He performs the highest of all miracles—the wonders of regeneration. These were introduced and attested by the miraculous cures, in which He restored the mental and physical constitution, depressed through sin below the ordinary healthy level, by those almighty interpositions on His part, which we designate miracles in the special sense.

In general, a miracle is that almighty and creative action of God, in which He manifests Himself as the eternal, self-existent, and wonderful One. Creation is the miracle *of deed*, which is interpreted by the word.

But within this general sphere, the miracles of the kingdom of God were, so to speak, announced and prepared by the special miraculous cycles in the ordinary course of nature, in which the symbolical miracle of nature appears. Here each stage of nature *prepares* for a higher; which in turn may be regarded as *above* nature, as *contrary* to nature, and yet as only *higher* nature, since it introduces a new and higher principle of life, into the existent and natural order of things.* It is not the law of nature which causes the principle of nature, but the principle of nature which lies at the basis of the law of nature. Each lower stage *prepares* for a new, in which a higher principle of life appears. This higher sphere may always be regarded as *supernatural*, because it goes beyond the former stage, and even as in a sense *contrary* to nature, because the former stage becomes, so to speak, the pabulum for this new and higher life; while in reality it is only a *higher* manifestation of nature which unfolds in accordance with the principles of development peculiar to itself.

Thus the chemical principle appeared as a miracle in the elementary world, as introducing a new and higher life; similarly, the principle of crystallization is a miracle with reference to the lower principle of chemical affinity; the plant, a miracle above the crystal; the animal, a miracle in reference to the plant; and man, over all the animal world. Lastly, Christ, as the second man, the God-Man, is a miracle above all the world of the first man, who is of the earth, earthy (1 Cor. xv.).

The Lord Jesus would have been an absolute miracle even in the world before the fall of Adam; much more since, instead of ascending to spirituality, man has through sin become the slave of the flesh, and thus degraded nature below its proper level. Hence Christ is not only a higher and a transforming principle in the sphere of our natural world; but, appearing among sin-laden men, He is also the Judge, the Redeemer, and the Saviour.

The New Testament miracle, then, is that working of Christ by word and deed which springs from the new principle of absolute life and salvation, and manifests itself in judgment and deliverance, in redemption and transformation.

* [Comp. also R. Ch. Trench: *Notes on the Miracles*, Preliminary Essay, p. 9–81 (Amer. ed., 1856; in England this useful work has already gone through seven editions); Horace Bushnell (of Hartford): *Nature and the Supernatural as together constituting the one System of God*, New York, 1858 (a work of rare power and genius), especially ch. x and xi.; Dr. Ths. H. Skinner: *Miracles, the Proof of Christianity*, New York, 1863 (in the Amer. Presbyt. and Theol. Rev. for April, 1863, p. 177 sqq.); Prof. A. Hovey of Newton Centre: *The Miracles of Christ*, Boston, 1864; and a number of recent dissertations on Miracles called forth by the "*Essays and Reviews*" controversy, especially one by Prof. H. L. Mansel, B. D. of Oxford, in the "*Aids to Faith*," Lond. and New York, 1862.—P. S.]

* [In German: "Hier ist das Wunder der *wohlvermittelte, übernatürliche, widernatürliche* und *höhere natürliche* Durchbruch eines neuen höheren Lebensprincips durch die bereits vorhandene gesetzmässige Ordnung der Dinge." This is a fair specimen of Dr. Lange's style in the more doctrinal and philosophical portions of his Commentary.—P. S.]

But, as the advent of the first man was prepared and predicted by those symbolical miracles of the various stages of nature that gradually ascended toward man as their climax, so was the miraculous advent of the second man from heaven—of Christ, the Redeemer and Transformer of the world—prepared and predicted by the miracles of the Old Testament, which took place within that sphere of human life and nature, which sin had darkened. These were essentially miracles of the *coming* regeneration, or of the advent of the God-Man.

In the symbolical sphere of nature, the miracle appears, in the *first* instance, as a *symbolical deed* on the part of God, which only to the mind of him who is enlightened by the Spirit of God becomes transformed into a miraculous *word*. It is otherwise within the sphere of the ancient theocracy. Here the wondrous *deed of God*, and the *human*, but inspired *word of prophecy*, which in its symbolic import evokes the wondrous deed, go hand in hand (we might almost say, in a *harmonia præstabilita*). Lastly, within the sphere of Christianity, the miracle, as deed, flows from the theanthropic word of the incarnate Word. In general, spiritual regeneration is always the first, and is afterward followed by miraculous cure, or transformation of nature, though in individual cases that order may seem partly reversed.

We may sketch, in the following table, the miracle in its development and varied manifestations (general expression for miracles: *θαύματα, θαυμάσια, παράδοξα, miracula* ; פֶּלֶא , מִפְלָאוֹת , נִפְלָאוֹת).

(1) *σημεῖον, τεκμήριον.*	(2) *δύναμις.*	(3) *τέρας.*	(4) *ἔργον.*
signum.	*virtus, potenter factum.*	*ostentum, portentum.*	*factum, opus.*
מוֹפֵת , אוֹת , נֵס .	גְּבוּרוֹת , גְּבוּרָה .	מוֹרָא .	מִפְלָאֹת , etc.
Prepared sign of the approaching new principle in the kingdom of God.	*Supernatural* effect of this principle on its appearance.	*Contra-natural* effect of it, as compared with the former stage, especially in the fallen condition.	Higher, or rather highest naturalness. Manifestation of the new, heavenly, and spiritual nature.
Definition of **Augustine:**	**Thomas Aquinas:**	The 17th cent.; **Quenstedt:**	**Nitzsch:**
Portentum non fit contra naturam, sed contra quam est nota natura. (*De civitate Dei*, xxi. 8.)	Miraculum, quod fit *præter* ordinem totius naturæ *creatæ*. (*Summa* i. quæst. 110, art. 4.)	Miracula, quæ contra vim rebus naturalibus a deo inditam cursumque naturalem efficiuntur. (*Syst. Theol.* p. 471.)	Miracles are part of a higher order of things, which, however, is also nature. (*System der Christl. Lehre*, p. 85.)
(Prevailing view in the Gospel by Matthew.)	(Prevailing view in the Gospel by Luke.)	(Prevailing view in the Gospel by Mark.)	(Prevailing view in the Gospel by John.)

As the principle of all principles, Christ is the absolute law of all laws of nature and life. Hence, (1) There was preparation for Him. As all nature tended toward, and was a prediction of, man, so all humanity tended toward Christ and is fulfilled and perfected by Him. (2) He was supernatural in reference to the old world and to man's ordinary nature—the new spiritual man from heaven. (3) He was contra-natural: old Adam must die, and the old world perish. But this old natural life becomes in turn the substratum and the element for a new spiritual life. (4) He is natural in the highest sense. For in Him is all nature realized, redeemed, and admitted to share in the glorious liberty of the children of God.—We notice the same features in His miracles. (1) There is the preparation of faith on the part of those who receive, or else by the affection of those who intercede for others; occasionally, also, believing anticipation, as in the demoniacs; or a waiting for the Lord, as in the case of those raised from the dead; while no miracles are performed among unbelievers, Matt. xiii. 58. (2) They are supernatural—the manifestation of the almighty and saving power of the God-Man. (3) In a sense contra-natural, as putting an end to the existing state; as, for example, in the history of the Gadarenes, in the doom of the barren fig-tree, etc. (4) Natural in the highest sense (gradualness of the cure of the blind man at Bethsaida, use of natural means): presentation, in an outward fact, of the revival of inner life.

The series of Old Testament miracles opened, in the history of Abraham, by the miracle of word and of initial fulfilment (the wonderful birth of Isaac), long before the ordinary miracles of deed commenced with the life of Moses. The latter were in the first place symbolical miracles; they next became miracles of judgment and deliverance, and grew into miracles and healing, until, in the predictions of the prophets, they pointed forward to the period of transformation.

All these elements appear fully defined and perfected in the life of the Lord.

A. Miracles of the word and of fulfilment.	B. Miracles of deed.
(1) Miraculous birth of Christ to a spiritual human life in the world. He *is* of the Holy Ghost.	(1) The miraculous birth of Christ is the regeneration of humanity. Hence it is the power of regenerating, of *awakening the dead*, and *restoring the sick*. Jesus walking on the sea. Power of the spirit over nature.
(2) Christ miraculously attains to full consciousness of His calling as the Redeemer at His baptism in Jordan, and is glorified from above. He *has* the Holy Spirit as a spiritual power.	(2) Glimpse into heaven. Into the hearts (Nathanael); into the depths (the tribute penny, the draught of fishes); into the future (the colt). Miracles of judgment and deliverance. Deliverances in the sphere of mind and of nature. *Conversions, casting out of evil spirits.* Symbolical

	miracles of nature, both in judgment and deliverance. ("Parallel miracles.") The calming of the storm.
(3) Transfiguration of the Lord on the Mount. He *reveals* the Holy Ghost, and shines in the light of the Spirit.	(3) Miracles of transfiguration. The disciples sharing the heavenly rapture. The marriage at Cana. The miraculous feeding of the multitude. *Bread and wine in the kingdom of heaven.*
(4) The resurrection of the Lord. Transition to the second and heavenly life of man. Christ is glorified and *reigns* in the Holy Ghost.	(4) Christ raising the dead. New spiritual life. The maid on her *death-bed.* The young man in the *coffin.* Lazarus in the *grave.* Movement in the world of spirits at His resurrection. (Matthew.)
(5) Ascent of Christ into heaven: Christ rules far and near.	(5) Miraculous cures at a distance.
(6) The outpouring of the Holy Ghost upon His disciples: He *sends* the Holy Ghost.	(6) Anointing of His people; of believing humanity. Speaking with new tongues. Spread of His wondrous power in the life of Christianity.
(7) Return of Christ to judgment.	(7) The withered fig-tree. The Apostles sent into all the world.

Lastly, we remark, that Christianity itself shares these characteristics of the miraculous life and working of the Lord. For, 1. Being the religion of *history*, the *fulfilment* of the Old Testament and of all history, there has been due *preparation* for it in the course of history. 2. It is supernatural; being directly from heaven, and entirely new. 3. It is contra-natural; dooming sin and the world to death in its progress, and making use of natural life only as the element of a higher life. 4. Yet this miracle is only the highest naturalness; being the religion of true spiritual life, which leads to the transformation of the world. On the other hand, all the effects of Christianity may be arranged into miracles of *formation* (regeneration), and miracles of *deed* (the healing of the cosmos), until the goal shall be reached in the transformation of the world.

In the Sermon on the Mount, the Lord had displayed the full riches of spiritual life. He preached as one who had authority, and not as the scribes. This became evident immediately on His descent from the high pulpit, by the miracles which He performed. In the mind of the Evangelists, these miracles, however different, are connected, and form a higher unity, although their historical succession is never overlooked. But the cure of Peter's mother-in-law, and of the great multitude of sick persons, especially demoniacs, belongs to a former period, as has already been stated. All the other miracles were performed at the time of Christ's second stay in Capernaum. The interrupted journey to Gadara is their centre.

But just as the utterances on the Mount were Divine deeds, so these deeds by which the Great Prophet confirms His word are also oracles of God,—*i. e.*, Divine deeds which serve as symbols of the infinite truth and grace, and of the power of the Gospel to save.

It is significant that the miraculous cures of Jesus began with that of leprosy. This cure marks the new era in life, as the Sermon on the Mount marked that in doctrine. According to the Old Testament, he who touched a leper became unclean. Jesus touches the leper, and not only remains clean Himself, but by His touch cleanses the leper.—Still more remarkable is the second miracle. It consists in help given to a Gentile, and that on the strength of a faith which is declared to surpass that of the Jews. If in the former case the cure was effected by touch, it now takes place at a distance; thus symbolizing that the influence of the blessed Saviour extended not only to those who were near, but also to the Gentiles at a distance.—Next, we have the miraculous cure of Peter's mother-in-law—in contra-distinction to the low estimate of woman in the old world. He takes her by the hand, and, being restored, she serves Him.—Jesus has now to cope with the whole weight of demoniacal suffering in and around Capernaum; but He proves equal to the load, and removes it.—Here we reach the period of His journey to Gadara, during which the Lord, by a different mode of treatment, restored two of His professing disciples from their spiritual disease—enthusiasm in the one case, and slowness of faith in the other.—The Lord next appeases the storm at sea, and, with it, the storm of anxiety in the souls of His disciples;—on the eastern shore, in the land of the Gadarenes, He performs the cure of two demoniacs who had been the terror of the whole district. But this miracle diffused greater terror among the Gadarenes than the demoniacs had ever done. The banishment of Jesus from that territory, consequent on this cure, may be regarded as the first formal rejection of the Lord. Orthodox Israel expelled Jesus for the sake of a herd of swine. No better fate awaits Him on the western shore of the lake. The healing of one afflicted with the palsy, whose faith had overcome all obstacles intervening between Christ and him, served as the occasion of stirring up the enmity of the scribes, who denounced as blasphemy His forgiving of sin. Among these miracles, Matthew introduces his own calling. A wonder of grace this, not less than the others, that a publican, one excommunicated, should be called to the apostleship. If the Pharisees found fault because He ate with the publicans and sinners, the disciples of John objected on the ground that His disciples fasted not, as they and the Pharisees did. The former cavil the Lord rebutted by reminding the Pharisees of the contrast between sacrifice and mercy; the latter, by pointing out that between the marriage and fasting, the new wine and the Old bottles. Then for the first time the Lord raised the dead, restoring the daughter of Jairus from the death-bed to life; the cure of the woman afflicted with an issue of blood being introduced by the way. Next, two blind men recovered their sight, on the distinct profession of their faith that Jesus was the Messiah (the Son of David).—We regard it as a further progress in these miracles when He heals the dumb demoniac; and by the word of His power at the same time reveals and removes the cause of his affliction. After all these

miracles, the Pharisees begin to revile Him, and to say, that "He cast out devils by the prince of the devils." These were the very worst devils with whom Christ had to contend. The blind receive their sight, but they who see become blind; the possessed recover, but those who administered healing in Israel are cast into the kingdom of Satan. Christ now passes victoriously from His prophetic to His royal administration, which commences with the mission of His Apostles.

2. We have already pointed out how significantly the series of miracles in Matthew opens with the recovery of a leper. Another point deserves notice. The Old Testament provided no remedy for the leper, nor was he tolerated in the congregation. His disease was treated like sin; he was banished from the camp; and whosoever touched him, shared for a time that banishment. Levitical impurities, such as touching the dead, ceased after a certain period had elapsed; but the leper was excluded for an indefinite time—perhaps for ever. Their only hope of restoration to the Church lay in their recovery. Meantime the leper was left to the mercy of God. In this respect the arrangements of the synagogue were, as we have shown, less strict than those of the temple. In the Old Church, to touch an unclean person, rendered unclean; Christ, the Founder of the New Church, cleansed the leper by touching him. There is a formal disannulling of the old arrangement in this stretching forth of the hand and touching the leper, and in the words—"I will, be thou clean!" And yet the two institutions agree in spirit, for it is the object of both to exhibit the Church pure and unspotted. But what the Old Covenant could not bestow, the Lord vouchsafed. The Old Covenant could only distinguish, but not separate, between sin and misery. This the Lord accomplished. From the moment He touched the leper with His finger, suffering became hallowed, and the Lord entered into full fellowship with it. From that moment until His death on the cross, Christ remained in continuous fellowship with the suffering of the world. True, it seems as if His contact with the leper had not led to any immediate suffering; but from the narrative in Luke we gather that such was the case. The leper related what Jesus had done for him, and traditionalism may have pronounced the Lord unclean. On this account He retired for a time into the wilderness, thence to issue to fresh manifestations of His miraculous power. If the first miracle presented a striking contrast to the old order of things, the second was still more remarkable as being performed on the heathen slave of a heathen household. True, the attachment of the centurion to the synagogue formed a kind of intermediate link of connection; but Matthew passes over this circumstance as apparently secondary, in view of the grand motive influencing the Lord—the faith of the centurion. Viewed in their combination, the two miracles show that infinite mercy reaches to the lowest depths of misery, and extends to the utmost bounds of the earth—its only conditions being personal need and believing trust.

3. The acknowledgment of proselytes of the gate may be regarded as a victory of the genuine theocratic spirit over Pharisaism, which at an earlier period had been typified in the construction of a "court of the Gentiles" in the second temple. It was not a new arrangement, but a recurrence to the faith and practice of the patriarchs, in room of the rigor of legalism. The synagogue and the court of the Gentiles were the gates by which the heathen might enter the Jewish Church; the proselytes of the gate formed the intermediate link between heathenism and the theocracy. Thus the way was opened for the Gospel. As instances of the religious movement among soldiers at that time, we mention not merely the three centurions in the Gospels and the Book of Acts, but also the soldiers who resorted to John the Baptist, Luke iii. 14.

4. The judgment of outer darkness referred to the severest dispensations upon earth, and in Hades; although there is some difference between it and the final judgment of hell-fire, Matt. xxv.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The miracles of the Lord, as confirming His prophetical word.—Christ the Great Prophet in word and deed.—The words of the Lord effectual as Divine deeds; and the deeds of the Lord also a word from heaven.—The miracles of Jesus in their blessed import: 1. As witnessing to His Gospel; 2. as works of love; 3. as seals of His power; 4. as manifestations of the liberty of the New Covenant; 5. as rays of His Divine glory.—The word of the Lord inspiring poor fallen man with fresh courage: 1. Even the leper may now hope for deliverance; 2. he presses forward among the people; 3. he casts himself at the feet of the Lord, as if he entered into the most holy place; 4. his prayer implies the conviction that there was help even for him.—The healing of the leper a sign of hope to the world: 1. The Lord can restore even where a case seems desperate; 2. He is willing to do it; 3. He does it by entering into fellowship with the sufferings of the world; 4. by His suffering He takes away ours; 5. He separates between sin and its counterpart, misery; thus taking away the strength of sin.—The Lord is able also to heal the leprosy of the inner man.—The power of death conquered by that of life.—The purity of love removing the impurity of misery.—The Lord of glory in contact with the infectious diseases of the world.—The glory of the Lord, as appearing in His mode of granting deliverance: 1. He quickly hears; 2. He briefly speaks: "I will!" 3. He sovereignly stretches forth His hand.—"Tell no man, but show thyself to the priest." True reticence and proper publicity of our recovery.—"Show thyself to the priest:" or, how the Lord honors the Old Dispensation at the very moment when He founds the New.—Faith, whether obtrusive in its entreaties, or retiring in its complaints and prayer, is always the same in its nature.—The centurion of Capernaum a model of believing confidence: 1. In his earnest entreaty; 2. in his cordial affection; 3. in his unfeigned humility; 4. in the peculiar shape in which his profession of Christ appeared.—Faith always goes hand in hand with compassion.—Faith with its power of intercession.—Humility the crown of faith: 1. It springs from faith; 2. it rests upon faith, purifying and quickening it; 3. it manifests itself in the surrender of every claim, and in firm confidence while praying.—The distinguishing excellences of the centurion's faith: 1. Humility, by which his military rank in the world gave place to conscious poverty before the Lord; 2. trustfulness,—his outward circumstances and position serving as a testimony to the glory of the Lord.—The pious household.—The faith of the centurion and that in Israel.—The faith of the centurion foreshadowing the bringing in of the Gentiles.—The guests of the kingdom of heaven, gathered

from the four corners of the earth, and the children of the kingdom.—The great transformation of *near* and *far* in the kingdom of God: 1. In the course of history: *a.* at the time of Christ; *b.* at the time of the migration of nations; *c.* at the time of the Reformation. 2. Its inner lesson: *a.* the penitent sinner, who relinquishes every claim, hears the call of mercy afar off; *b.* the least appearance of self-righteousness obstructs our view of the light of salvation, however near.—The banqueting room lit up, and outer darkness.—To be cast into outer darkness implies,—1. the darkness of final judgment, in opposition to the glory and beauty of the kingdom of God; 2. the society of the spirits of darkness, in opposition to that of the patriarchs; 3. sorrow and shame, in opposition to eternal blessedness.—The three heathen centurions compared with the wise men from the East.—"I will come and heal him."—Jesus is willing to come and heal the Gentiles.—Jesus is able to bless the Gentiles, even at a distance.—"In the self-same hour;" or, the Lord sends help at the right moment.—The hour of grace.—Loving zeal a characteristic of the kingdom of heaven: 1. The servant obeying his master from attachment and devotedness; or, Christianity in the domestic circle and in civil society. 2. The centurion serving his subordinate from esteem and compassion; or, Christian philanthropy. 3. Christ serving both; or, the kingdom of grace.

Starke:—*Quesnel:* Ministers must ofttimes condescend to those who are in misery, visit them in their sorrow, and point them for relief to the word of God, Acts viii. 30.—A blessing ever attaches to our following Jesus, ch. xix. 27; Luke viii. 43.—*Majus:* If we have tasted Christ, the Bread of life, we shall always hunger after it, and follow Him, ch. v. 6; Isa. lv. 1.—*Zeisius*: Outward leprosy a type of original sin, or of spiritual leprosy, Ps. li. 7; Isa. i. 6.—Bodily affliction often the occasion of leading us to Christ. O blessed sorrow! 1 Pet. iv. 1; Jer. xxx. 11.—The whole world a vast sick-ward.—A Christian must not insist on anything in prayer, ch. xxvi. 39.—*Zeisius:* The surest and most effectual means in all our sorrows, is recourse to prayer, Dan. ix. 3, 4; ch. xv. 25. —*Quesnel:* Let us not despise even the greatest sinners, nor avoid meeting them, provided we beware of infection, Gal. vi. 1; James v. 19, 20.—*Bibl. Tub.:* Jesus can and will deliver us in our most grievous afflictions, and where all human means were in vain, Ps. vi. 9, 10.—*Majus:* The word of Christ is an effectual remedy for curing spiritual leprosy, John xv. 3.—The most acceptable sacrifice on the part of those who have been restored, is new obedience, John v. 14; Isa. xxxviii. 15.—We are bound publicly to acknowledge the goodness of God, Rom. v. 11; Ps. xxvi.—*The centurion*, a soldier, a heathen, and a superior, cares for his subordinates, and prays for his servant, is humble, and believes in Christ. Go thou and do likewise. Rom. xv. 4; 1 Cor. x. 11; *Bibl. Tub.*—Let us not despair of the conversion of any man, in any condition of life.—What too frequently military men are not, and what they should be.—*Osiander:* A genuine Christian will plead with Jesus not only for his own wants, but also for those of his neighbor.—The cross is sent even to pious families, and sometimes to the best members of them.—"The Lord is near to all that call upon Him," Ps. cxlv. 18, 19; vi. 10.—Lord Jesus, speak the word only!—We admire riches, beauty, power, or art; but Christ admires faith.—All men have not faith, 2 Thess. iii. 2. —*Osiander:* Ofttimes we find more faith with soldiers and worldly persons than in many who pretend to be saints.—*Luther:* Faith is not confined to time, place, or condition. God has had a people at a time when it was little thought, in places where we should not have expected to find them, and among persons whom we would not have imagined to be His.—*Majus:* Believers under the Old and New Testaments have all the same doctrine, the same faith, the same kingdom, and the same glory, Heb. xiii. 8; Acts xv. 11.—The rejection of the Jews caused by their unbelief, Rom. xi. 20; Isa. liii. 1; vi. 9; Deut. ix. 23.—Lo, the children who trust in external service, in the temple, and in the possession of gifts, are condemned; while strangers who are sincere in the faith are received: Isa. ii. 4, etc.—The more light and grace we have rejected, the greater will be the condemnation and darkness awarded us.—Blessedness of intercession, James v. 18; 2 Kings xix. 34; Jer. xxix. 7.—The stronger our faith, the less will God refuse us, especially in spiritual requests.—True faith the source of all other gifts. *Quesnel.*

Gerlach:—*Luther* (Randglosse): Faith does not *know*, it *trusts* in the mercy of God. Faith ever says, If Thou *wilt;* not, if Thou *canst.*—Weeping and gnashing of teeth: the former perhaps the expression of softer, the latter of bolder, characters.

Heubner:—Jesus *can* and *will* deliver.—Jesus is willing to come under our roof, although we be unworthy of it.—The kingdom of heaven the meeting-place of the children of God from among all nations and from all climes.—The power of a living faith in Christ: 1. Its character. Faith cleanses from sin, makes holy, and induces us to procure help for others by leading them to Christ. 2. Inferences: Beware of unbelief, but strive after true faith.—All men are equal before the Lord Jesus.

II.

The disease in the family; the diseases in the city. **Salvation spreading from the household of Peter, or the dwelling of the Lord (the Church), into the city.**

Chapter VIII. 14–17.

14 **And when Jesus was** [had] come into Peter's house, **he saw his wife's mother laid,**
15 **and sick of a fever.** And he touched her hand, and the fever left her: **and she arose,**
16 **and ministered** unto them [him].[1] When the even [evening] was come, they brought
unto him many that were possessed with devils: and he cast out the spirits with *his* [a][2]

17 word, and healed all that were sick: That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by
Esaias [Isaiah] the prophet, saying, Himself took our infirmities, and barc [bore] *our*
sicknesses.

[1] Ver. 15.—Αὐτῷ is better supported than the reading of the *text. rec.* αὐτοῖς.

[2] Ver. 16.—[All the older E. V., also that of Rheims, correctly render λόγῳ: *with a word*, Wicl. *bi word*.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The accounts in Mark and Luke confirm the statement, that on the evening of the day when the Lord restored the mother-in-law of Peter, a large number of demoniacs in Capernaum were healed. Chronologically speaking, the event took place during the residence of the Lord at Capernaum, previous to His first journey into Galilee, and to the Sermon on the Mount. The statement of Luke, that Christ *rebuked* the disease, implies no contradiction. The healing word of Christ is omitted by Matthew and Mark, while Luke omits to mention that He took her by the hand and lifted her up. Lastly, according to Mark and Luke, the cure was performed on the intercession of the members of the family,—the sick person herself being unable to entreat help. From the circumstance that Jesus rebuked the fever, we gather that her disease was somehow connected with the sufferings resulting from demoniacal possessions then prevailing in the town.

Ver. 14. **Into the house of Peter.**—According to John i. 44, Peter and Andrew, as well as Philip, were natives of Bethsaida. Afterward, Peter, and probably Andrew (ch. iv. 18), had settled in Capernaum,—partly, perhaps, on account of the fisheries, and partly from his connection by marriage with the place. The marriage of Peter is also referred to in 1 Cor. ix. 5. It is remarkable that he who is said to have been the first bishop of Rome was a married man. Legend has it that her name was Perpetua, or Concordia; and that her husband accompanied her on her way to martyrdom in Rome. Their daughter was called Petronella. (Clement of Alexandria.)*

Ver. 15. **She ministered unto Him,** διηκόνει.—This refers particularly to waiting at table and serving, as an evidence of her perfect recovery.

Ver. 16. It was a time when there was in Capernaum a deep stirring of enthusiasm for the Lord—the evening of a great day—when this general longing seems to have seized the inhabitants of the place, and they brought unto Him their sick, especially those who were possessed with devils, and laid them down at the door of His house. On demoniacal possessions compare the remarks to Matt. iv. 24.

Ver. 17. **That it might be fulfilled.**—A reference to Isa. liii. 4: *Our diseases* (חֳלָיֵנוּ) *has He borne* (נָשָׂא), *and our sorrows* (מַכְאֹבֵינוּ) *He has taken on Himself* (סְבָלָם). In the Sept. more freely: τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν φέρει, καὶ περὶ ἡμῶν ὀδυνᾶται.—The Evangelist quotes from the original; but in strict accordance with its meaning, as Olshausen and others rightly remark, though Meyer denies it. It is true that in the original Hebrew, the Messiah is represented as bearing and expiating our sins. But our diseases are undoubtedly connected with sin on the one, and death on the other hand; while the suffering of Christ depends on His taking on Himself our sufferings, which again is connected with His carrying them away. We must not, however, go so far as Olshausen, and speak of spiritual exhaustion on the part of Christ. Meyer and von Ammon have overlooked the fact that, when healing those who were diseased, Christ entered into and shared their sufferings,—a circumstance evident from the narrative in Mark v. 30 (showing that He felt the going out of virtue from Him), as also from the resurrection of Lazarus. But, in the present instance, the Lord had to contend with the concentrated sorrow and sickness of the whole city, and that on the evening of a laborious day. For this labor and contest of the Lord, the Evangelist can find no more apt description than by quoting the passage from Isaiah. Christ takes away disease, in token of His removing its root, sin, by taking upon Himself death as the full wages and the full burden of sin.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The afflicted family and the afflicted city, both highly privileged by the presence and grace of Christ. Significant connection between them: salvation spreading from the house to the city.

2. The Evangelist gives us here the key to the mystery of Christ's atoning death. By His fellow-suffering with our diseases, He gradually descended into the unfathomable depth of His full sympathy with our death. Hence His miracles of healing partook of the nature of atoning suffering, and prepared for it. Accordingly, as He suffered in all He did, so His suffering and death crowned and completed all He had done. His active and passive obedience are most closely connected. But as in His fellow-suffering He took away the sting of suffering by taking away sin and awakening faith, so also has He swallowed up death in victory by discharging the debt of sin in His vicarious death, finishing the work of redemption, and introducing justifying faith. Such, then, was our reconciliation. In virtue of His perfect fellow-suffering, He submitted to the death due to us; by His perfect surrender to God, He became our reconciliation, even as by His communication of grace He wrought in us faith in the mercy of God, and in the imputation to us of His sacrificial service. His miracles form the introduction and the commencement of His reconciliation. Comp. 1 Pet. ii. 24.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The cross in the family.—The family and the

* [St. Jerome, in the interest of monastic celibacy, infers that the wife of Peter was dead at the time, from the fact that her mother, when cured, waited on the table. Archbishop Kenrick (Notes on the four Gospels) seems to approve of this inference. But the ministering of the mother is here evidently mentioned to show her complete recovery and her love and gratitude for it. In the natural order a long convalescence follows the cure of a fever before health returns. Moreover St. Paul many years after this occurrence (A. D. 57) refers to Peter's wife as living and accompanying her husband on his missionary journeys, 1 Cor. ix. 5. The Prot. V. correctly translates ἀδελφὴν γυναῖκα, "a sister a *wife*" (Tynd. and Cranmer: "a sister to *wife*;" Gen.: "a *wife* being a sister"); while the R. C. V. has: "a *woman* a sister."—P. S.]

town, as a household and a city of the Lord.—How Christianity elevated woman.—Christ and His people by turns engaged in the service of love. 1. He serves them; 2. they serve Him.—Rapid change produced in the house by the interposition of Christ: 1. One laid down by fever, an active hostess; 2. an anxious family, a festive circle; 3. the Lord a physician, the Lord a king; 4. the house an hospital, the house a church.—The right mode of celebrating our recovery.—From the church, salvation spreads to the city.—Glorious evening of power and grace.—The morbid sympathy of man, and the healing sympathy of the Lord. 1. With reference to the former,—*a.* disease itself appears in morbid and irresistible sympathy; *b.* morbid sympathy increases disease and pestilence; *c.* at best, it leads to excitement and running to the Lord, while not a few are unprepared and unready. 2. The sympathy of Christ: *a.* Its Divine power resists all sinful influences, especially cowardice and despair; *b.* it penetrates into, and lights up, the lowest depths of misery; *c.* it conquers and removes the sufferings of man.—*The sufferings of Christ* in His miraculous cures, pointing to the *great miraculous cure* by His *sufferings on the cross.*—Jesus has taken upon Him the diseases of man also.—The wards where those mentally afflicted are confined, belong also to the Lord.—The sceptre of Christ's triumph extends even over the cursed realm of demons.—The apparent strength of despair, and the Divine strength of perfect confidence.—Solemn night-seasons: 1. The night of suffering; 2. the night of repentance; 3. the night of death.

Starke:—If we recover from disease, it is our duty to thank God, and all the more zealously to serve Christ and our neighbor.—Let each bear another's burden, Gal. vi. 2.—*Zeisius:*—Above all, learn that sin is the root of all disease, and that by true repentance thou mayest be set free from it.—To visit, to comfort, to refresh, and to serve those who are laid on beds of sickness, Isa. xxxviii. 1, 4, 5; Ecclesiast. vii. 34.—*Gossner:*—To come, to see, and to heal is here one.

III.

Miraculous works of Jesus on His missionary journey: The troubled disciples—the troubled sea.

Chapter VIII. 18–27.

(*Ch. viii.* 23–27, *the Gospel for the 4th Sunday after Epiphany.*—Parallels: Mark iv. 35–41; Luke viii. 22–25; ix. 57–60.)

18 Now, when Jesus saw great multitudes[1] about him, he gave commandment to de-
19 part unto the other side. And a certain scribe came, and said unto him, Master, I will
20 follow thee whithersoever thou goest. And Jesus saith unto him, The foxes have
holes, and the birds of the air *have* nests;[2] but the Son of man hath not where to lay
21 *his* head. And another of his disciples said unto him, Lord, suffer me first to go and
22 bury my father. But Jesus said unto him, Follow me; and let the dead bury their
dead.
23 And when he was [had] entered into a[3] ship, his disciples followed him.
24 And, behold, there arose a great tempest in the sea, insomuch [so] that the ship was
25 covered with the waves: but he was asleep [sleeping]. And his disciples [they][4] came
26 to *him*, and awoke him, saying, Lord, save us [save]:[5] we perish. And he saith unto
them, Why are ye fearful, O ye of little faith? Then he arose, and rebuked the
27 winds [wind][6] and the sea; and there was a great calm. But the men marvelled,
saying, What manner of man[7] is this, that even the winds and the sea obey him!

[1] Ver. 18.—Lachmann with B. only: ὄχλον for ὄχλους. [Cod. Sinaiticus sustains the plural.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 20.—[Dr. Lange translates: *Wohnnester, Zelte, Horste, dwelling places, tents*, which is more literal for κατασκηνώσεις, but not so popular as *nests*.—P. S.]

[3] Ver. 23.—[Lange translates "*the* ship," τὸ πλοῖον, agreeing here with the Received Text and with Tischendorf's edition. But Codd. B., C. and other ancient authorities, and the editions of Lachmann, Tregelles, and Alford omit the article.—P. S.]

[4] Ver. 25.—*Recepta: οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ.* Various authorities [and Dr. Lange] omit αὐτοῦ. [Lachmann, Tregelles, Ewald, and Conant omit also *οἱ μαθηταί.* So does Cod. Sinait.—P. S.]

[5] Ver. 25.—*Us*, ἡμᾶς is omitted in Codd. B., C. al. [Cod. Sinait.] The speech is more lively and dramatic without ἡμᾶς. [Tischendorf, Lachmann, Tregelles, Lange, Conant, all omit ἡμᾶς.]

[6] Ver. 26.—[Cod. Sinait. reads the singular τῷ ἀνέμῳ for τοῖς ἀνέμοις.—P. S.]

[7] Ver. 27.—[Conant: "*What manner of man* belongs to the best English usage. '*What kind of man*,' or '*what sort of man*,' is not a suitable expression here." A. Norton (Translation of the Gospels with Notes, Bost., 1855) translates: "*Who* is this." But ποταπός is not simply τίς, but the interrogative of disposition, character, quality, *i. q.* ποῖος.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 18. **Now, when Jesus saw great multitudes.**—In this instance a motive for withdrawing, as in ch. v. 1; John vi. 3, 15.—There were seasons when the multitude would have proclaimed Him King: sudden outbursts of carnal excitement, from which the Lord withdrew. That such was the case in this instance, we gather from the profession made by the scribe in ver. 19.

Εἰς τὸ πέραν, to the opposite side of the lake.

Ver. 19. **And one, a scribe, came.**—The εἷς refers to the ἕτερος in ver. 21; from which verse we also gather that this scribe was already one of Christ's disciples, in the wider sense of the term, and that he now proposed henceforth to follow Jesus continuously. When the Evangelists mention these calls to follow the Lord in a particular sense of the term, they seem always to refer to the apostolic office, not to discipleship. But as Andrew, John, Peter, James the Elder, Nathanael or Bartholomew, and Philip, had been previously called, and as the persons here addressed could not have been any of the brothers of the Lord (James the Younger, Joseph, Judas Lebbeus or Thaddeus, and Simon), we conclude that they must have been either Judas Iscariot, Matthew, or Thomas. From the peculiar characteristics which appear in the narrative, we venture to suggest, that the first of the two scribes was Judas Iscariot, the second Thomas, and the third individual (who is only mentioned by Luke) Matthew. This is, however, merely a hypothesis made more or less probable by the nexus of history (comp. *Leben Jesu*, ii. 2, p. 651).—In the Gospel of Luke, this event is introduced at a later period, when Jesus prepared for His last journey to Jerusalem (ch. ix. 51-62). A superficial investigation will serve to convince us that the transaction between Jesus and the sons of thunder, recorded in Luke, had led to the introduction of this history in that connection. It seems like a psychological combination designed to exhibit Christ's mastery in dealing with different dispositions (say the four temperaments). Schleiermacher, Schneckenburger, Gfrörer, and Olshausen, adopt the chronology of Luke; Rettig, Meyer, and others, that of Matthew.

Ver. 20. Κατασκηνώσεις, "**Dwelling-places**, not *nests*, as birds do not live in their nests." De Wette.*

The Son of man.—Jesus adopted the name ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου no doubt with special reference to the prophetic vision in Dan. vii. 13, where Messiah is seen coming in the clouds of heaven, כְּבַר אֱנָשׁ. (Comp. Hävernick's *Daniel*.) Hitzig imagines that the Son of man seen by Daniel in the clouds was not the Messiah, but the whole people of Israel;—an absurd hypothesis, refuted by Ewald (in his "*Jahrbücher*" for 1850). Daniel saw only the image or likeness of the Son of man, who appeared in the full sense in Jesus of Nazareth. In all probability, Jesus chose this particular Old Testament designation of the Messiah, because, unlike the others, it had not been grossly perverted to foster the carnal expectations of the Jews. Thus our Lord met the morbid and fantastic expectations of His contemporaries—and among them, apparently, those also of the scribe in the text—by laying emphasis on His genuine and true humanity as the Messiah. His great aim was, that the people should view Him as true man—in the lowliness of His outward appearance, but also at the same time in His high character, as *the* Son of man, *i. e.*, the ideal man, the second Adam from heaven (1 Cor. xv.). The bold supposition of Weisse, that the term, "*Son of man*," is used in opposition to the name of *Messiah*, deserves no refutation. It is remarkable that John had similarly avoided the title of *Elijah*, under which Malachi had predicted his advent, while he chose the designation given him by Isaiah: "*The voice of one crying in the wilderness*." The reason of this was, that carnal notions concerning the Messianic kingdom were connected with the former, but not with the latter expression (John i. 19, etc.). Meyer conceives that there is an antithesis implied in the term, "*Son of man*," as opposed to "*Son of God*," and denies the conception of ideal humanity (p. 82).* According to Augustine, there is a faint allusion to the *boastfulness* of the scribe in the expression, "birds of the air." But this seems strained; and we would rather apply the term to the unreliable and fugitive character of his enthusiasm, while the word, "foxes," refers to cunning.

Where to lay His head.—A picture of a homeless pilgrim: hence, not of want in the ordinary sense, but of voluntary poverty. The answer of Christ implied, not a positive refusal of the overture of the scribe, but a solemn warning. He who saw not as men do, perceived, under that excessive profession of this man, an amount of unreliableness and insincerity which called for such caution.

Ver. 21. **Another of His disciples.**—In the stricter [rather in the wider] sense of the term—such as the "scribe" had been. Clement of Alexandria (*Stromat.* iii. 4) suggests that this disciple was Philip; but he had been called at an earlier period.

Bury my father.—The father had died. According to some critics, his old father was still alive, and the expression, *to bury*, meant to take care of him till his end, and then to commit him to his last resting-place. But the call to follow Christ immediately, evidently implies, that at the time the father was actually dead. *Burial* was the most ancient mode of disposing of the dead (Cic. *Legg.* ii. 22; Plin. vii. 55), and was always practised by the Jews, in opposition to the Greek custom of burning the dead, which was quite exceptional among the Jews. It was considered the duty of sons to bury their parents, Gen. xxv. 9; xxxv. 29, etc. Tobith iv. 3. Comp. Winer *sub voce: Begraben*, Schöttgen's *Horæ* [W. Smith: *Bibl. Dict.* sub *Burial*, vol. i. 233].

Ver. 22. **Let the dead bury their dead.**—Artificial explanations see in Meyer's Commentary. The sentence is an Oxymoron, by which the burial of the dead is assigned to those who are spiritually dead.† The expression conveys to the hesitating disciple that there were more urgent duties in the kingdom of heaven than that of burying the dead,

* [Meyer to the same effect: "Places of abode where the birds are used to live, to sleep, etc. comp. xiii. 32; not specifically *nests*."—]

* [Not, however, in a rationalistic sense, but as contrasted with His former δόξα. Meyer correctly sees in the term: *the Son of man* an expression of the κένωσις, *which implies the consciousness of a purely divine and eternal preexistence* (*in deren Hintergrunde das Bewusstsein der rein göttlichen Urexistenz liegt*).—P. S.]

† [The key to this and all the other paradoxical sentences of Christ is the different senses—a higher and a lower, a spiritual and a literal—in which the same word is used. Let those who are dead in spirit (in trespasses and sins) bury their kindred and friends who are dead in body.—P. S.]

and particularly, of going through all the ceremonies connected with a Jewish burial. At the same time, it also alludes to the goal and end of those who are spiritually dead—their last and highest aim here is to bury one another. Death of the soul is connected with death of the body.—Celsus (according to Origen) founded on this passage the objection, that the Saviour demanded what was inconsistent with duty to parents. But He only subordinates the duty of a Christian toward his own household and family, especially when another could take his place, to the highest of all duties—those of his spiritual calling, and to his Master.* Lastly, we infer from this trait, that this and the former reply were addressed to disciples in the narrower sense of the term.

Ver. 23. **The ship,** τὸ πλοῖον.—With the article, meaning a definite ship, which waited to take them across the lake; the words of Jesus having induced His disciples (in the narrower sense) to follow Him implicitly.†

Ver. 24. Σεισμὸς,—indicating the effect, of which the cause (the *winds*, ver. 26) is afterward mentioned—a violent commotion of the sea. On the sudden storms occasioned by the situation of the Lake of Galilee, comp. Schubert iii. 237; Robinson ii. 416.

Ver. 25. **Save! we perish!** Σῶσον, ἀπολλύμεθα.—Asyndetic (disconnected) language of intense anxiety.

Ver. 26. **Why are ye fearful?**—The word "*afraid*" would be too weak, and "*cowardly*" too strong. At any rate, it was a fearfulness which the Lord censured. It is worthy of special notice, that, according to Matthew, the Lord first rebuked the disciples, and after that the sea. *See* גָּעַר, Ps. cvi. 9. (Mark and Luke reverse the order.)

Ver. 27. **The men,** οἱ ἄνθρωποι.—The men in their human nature,—more particularly, in their rapid transition from extreme anxiety to boundless admiration. Hence we infer that it applied to the disciples, and not, as Meyer supposes, to other parties accompanying Jesus. According to the account given by Mark, other vessels went along with that which bore the Lord; so that He must have been followed by a numerous company of disciples.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. In dealing with the different characters of the disciples, and adapting Himself to their natural dispositions, the Lord showed how closely He read, and how wisely He directed, the hearts of men. (*Leben Jesu*, ii. 2, 651; iii. 422.)

2. *The Son of man.* The description furnished by Daniel of the appearance of Messiah, under the form of the Son of man, indicates a very advanced stage of the prophetic doctrine of the Messiah. But, in order clearly to perceive its import, we must compare this term, as used by Daniel, with the passage about the seventy weeks (Dan. ix.). [In the sixty-third week, the *Messiah who was not a prince*, was to be set aside by the advent of the people of *the Prince who was not Messiah.*] After seven weeks, *i. e.*, at the close of the seventy weeks—cometh *the Messiah, who, at the same time, is also a Prince.* Hence the figure of the Son of man combines the two ideas of the suffering and the glorified Messiah. As the Son of humanity to which the curse attaches, He is humbled and rejected; while, as the Son of humanity on which the blessing is bestowed, He is exalted and declared Lord of an eternal kingdom. Gerlach: "The first man was simply called *Adam*—*i. e.*, man, and every descendant of his is called *a* son of man; but Christ is called *the* Son of man, as being derived from Adam, and yet the Head of a new race, 1 Cor. xv. 47."

3. The import of the miracle of stilling the tempest has frequently been misunderstood. Paulus (of Heidelberg) resolves it into a *natural* phenomenon; Ammon regards it as an *allegory* or *symbol*; while Strauss treats it as a *myth.** It may also be turned into *magic*,† if, with Meyer, we were to overlook the connection between the tempest in the hearts of the disciples and that on the lake—between sin in man, and "the convulsions and throes of nature" (Olshausen)—and regard this history as merely a *direct* act of power exercised upon the elements, and nothing else. In this respect, it is sufficient to remind the reader of Rom. viii. 20. Not that we thereby explain the miracle, but that we present its Christian aspect. The Lord rebukes the storm in the minds of His disciples; thus preparing for calming the tempest on the sea.—He takes away the sin of the microcosm, in order then to remove the evils of the macrocosm. Hence this event has frequently been regarded as a symbol of the passage of the Church of Christ through the world. There is another aspect of it which deserves attention. In this miracle, the operation of the Son and of the Father coincide; as the New Testament completion of the Old Testament miracles upon nature, it is at the same time a prediction and a miracle, and thus a sign that the Son had, in the name of the Father, entered upon the government of the world.

4. Our modern degenerate and false philanthropy fails to perceive the difference between a soul that is *mourning* and one which is *fearful* or *desponding*. It is altogether erroneous, and must fail of its desired effect, if we administer to the fearful the comfort which is only appropriate to the afflicted. The latter, Christ ever upheld with words of kindness; while He rebuked the fearful, by setting before them the terrors of His word, and thus recalling them to a better state of mind. Thus He rebuked those who were possessed, who by their coward-

* [Chrysostom: "Jesus forbade him to go, in order to show that nothing, not even the most important work of natural duty and affection, is so momentous as care for the kingdom of heaven; and that nothing, however urgent, should cause us to be guilty of a moment's delay in providing first for that. What *earthly* concern could be more necessary than to bury a father? a work, too, which might be done speedily. And yet the answer is: 'Let the dead bury their dead. Follow thou me.' If, then, it is not safe to spend even so little time as is requisite for the burial of a parent, to the neglect of spiritual things, how guilty shall we be if we allow slight and trivial matters to withdraw us, who are Christ's disciples, from His service! But rather let us endeavor, with Christ's aid, to raise those who are spiritually dead and buried, from the death of sin to a life of righteousness, as He raised Lazarus from the tomb, then we shall be His disciples indeed."—P. S.]

† [Wordsworth likewise presses the def. art. τό, and quotes from Bengel: "Jesus habebat *scholam ambulantem*;" he sees in this ship an emblem of the church. But, unfortunately for this interpretation, the article is of very doubtful authority, *see* our crit. note above.—P. S.]

* [In German: "Von Paulus *naturalisirt*, von Ammon *allegorisirt*, von Strauss *mythisirt*" (better: *mythificirt*).—P. S.]

† [Not: "presented in a *material light*," as the Edinb. trl. has it, misled by a printing error of the first edition. The third ed. reads: "Es kann freilich auch *magisch* gemacht (not: *materialisirt*) werden," etc.—P. S.]

ice had become the prey of unclean spirits; and similarly He rebuked the disciples, when from want of faith they were desponding or fearful. Thus also He rebuked the fever which weighed down the mother-in-law of Peter; and, in the present instance, the sea and the winds. Such a rebuke must, of course, be regarded as symbolical, since neither sea nor tempest had personal consciousness. The ultimate ground of this rebuke lay in the fact, that the disturbances of nature were caused by unclean spirits. Christ apparently regarded those sudden outbursts in nature not as manifestations of healthy and regular force, but as manifestations of weakness; just as the fever was the consequence of inherent weakness, or of a germ of death, against which nature employed her utmost efforts in convulsive struggle.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Jesus sees the multitude and approaches them; Jesus sees the multitude and retires from them. 1. The fact itself,—(*a*) in the Gospel history; (*b*) in that of the Church; (*c*) in individual Christian communities. 2. Explanation of the fact: (*a*) He approaches when He sees multitudes longing for His salvation and waiting upon His word; (*b*) He retires at the first appearance of fanaticism, which would have confirmed the carnal expectations of man, and not the word of God.—The Lord eschews the sinful obtrusion of worldly men, in order to seek out the poor and the needy, afar off.—The watchword of Christ: *To the other side!* 1. A watchword of faith, breaking through all narrow boundaries; 2. a watchword of love, overcoming all selfishness; 3. a watchword of courage, overcoming all dangers.—The Saviour and the spiritual distemper of His disciples: 1. Spurious enthusiasm in our own strength (*I will*); 2. spurious scruples and spiritual hesitation (*Suffer me*).—Jesus the great model of pastoral work.—Jesus warning superficial enthusiasts to *count the cost* of following Him.—If we are willing to follow the Lord, we must become homeless wanderers, and be ready to renounce all our comforts.—The Son of man has not where to lay His head. 1. The fact: at the commencement, the manger; at the close, the cross; during His pilgrimage, a bench on the ship. 2. Its import,—(*a*) so far as *He* is concerned; (*b*) so far as *we* are concerned.—The nests and caves of professing disciples who are not ready to yield their all to Christ. They seek,—(*a*) *high places* (nests) in time of prosperity; (*b*) *places of concealment* (caves) in the hour of adversity.—Jesus teaches His faithful disciples to get quit of their scruples and hesitation by considering the final aim of life.—*Let the dead bury their dead:* 1. Compared with following Christ, which he had undertaken, this was the lesser duty; 2. others were able to take his place; 3. the disciple seemed to hesitate between two duties, while yet he had taken upon him the yoke of Christ.—Is a collision of duties possible? As little as,—(*a*) between the commandments of God; (*b*) between the angels of God; (*c*) between the ways of God; for such, indeed, are all duties, so far as we are concerned.—It is characteristic of the spiritually dead, that they busy themselves with special affection about the ceremonials of life.—The dead bury their dead: such is the end of all unbelieving lives.—Symbolical import of the passage of Christ with His disciples across the sea. It is a figure of all His leadings,—(*a*) of the people of God (the ark, etc.); (*b*) in the history of the Church; (*c*) in the experience of believers.—The unexpected tempest: 1. After so glorious a day, and on the beautiful, tranquil lake; 2. in company with the Lord Himself.—We read only once of the Lord being asleep,—a sleep full of majesty: (*a*) a sabbatic rest after His labor at Capernaum; (*b*) a sign of deep calm in the midst of the dreadful tempest; (*c*) a preparation for the most glorious awakening; (*d*) a type of His rest in the grave.—The cry of despair becomes a prayer when in proximity to the Lord.—How the Lord purifies even the supplications of the helpless.—All fearfulness or despondency in life springs from want of faith.—The *little faith* of the disciples: 1. A want of faith in what it forgot (Christ's presence in the ship; the hope of Israel, the salvation of the race); 2. still faith in that they took refuge to Christ.—Jesus calms every storm.—*What manner of man is this!*—The admiration of Jesus a transition to praise and adoration. Our gratitude for deliverance and salvation should ever end in praise.

Starke:—We should occasionally retire into solitude, Luke vi. 12; v. 16.—Much preaching wearies the body, Eccles. xii. 12; Mark vi. 31.—Sudden fervor and good inclinations are not equivalent to following Christ.—Many would like to be pious, but at the same time to retain their nests, houses, riches, honor, and comforts, ch. xvi. 24.—We must not run before God calls, Rom. x. 15.—Christ rejects none who come to Him, John vi. 37; but he who desires only earthly things from Him, receives a solemn warning. *Cramer.*—Christ, the Lord of heaven and earth, became poorer than the beasts that perish; yet His poverty is our riches, 2 Cor. viii. 9.—The poor, who have nothing of their own, may well derive comfort from the voluntary poverty of Jesus. *Quesnel.*—2 Cor. xi. 27.—Man is always opposed to the will of God: he either lags behind, or is determined to run before. The right way is, to wait till God speaks, and then not to delay a single moment following Him, Isa. lv. 8.—The spiritually dead, Heb. xi. 6; Jer. v. 3.—They who accompany the dead, are themselves subject to death.—A seafaring life affording striking signs of God's wisdom and power (Ps. cvii. 23), but used for merely selfish purposes. *Zeisius.*—God leads His own wondrously, but well, Ps. xli. 4.—Through fire and water, Ps. xci. 14; Isa. xliii. 2; xliii. 16.—Genuine Christians follow their Saviour through storm and tempest, even unto death, 2 Cor. vi. 4; Ps. lxxiii. 23.—If Christ do not immediately come to our help, we are prone to imagine that He is asleep; but He never oversleeps the hour of our deliverance.—United prayer is the most effectual.—Prayer the best anchor in danger.—Let Christians beware of cowardice: His Church will continue so long as He endures. *Bibl. Wirtemb.*—In seasons of extreme danger, the omnipotence and mercy of the Saviour is most fully and gloriously displayed, 2 Chron. xx. 12; Isa. xxxiii. 10; 2 Cor. i. 8.—Weak faith is nevertheless faith, only it must increase.—After the tempest, sunshine.—The works of God, and His marvellous power in our deliverance, call for praise and thanksgiving.—Under the cross we learn what wonders our Lord worketh.—Gratitude, Ps. xiv. 7; Rom. xi. 20.

Gossner:—Christ taught His disciples in a wandering school. Here He led them to the stormy lake to teach them fearlessness.—Fearlessness great happiness.

Heubner:—Our whole life may be compared to a sea voyage, in which we make for the heavenly haven.—"*Christus habet suas horas et moras.*"—Christ

the Lord of nature.—The passage across the lake, a figure of our lives: 1. The commencement; 2. the progress; 3. the end.

Lisco:—Luther: Some make a pretext of good works for not following Christ; but the Lord shows that these are dead works.—Almighty power of Christ, by which He overcomes the world, and renders everything subservient to the kingdom of God.

The *pericope*, the calming of the tempest, ver. 24–27.

Dräseke:—The passage across the lake, a figure of spiritual calm: 1. In reference to its character; 2. in reference to its origin; 3. in reference to its effects.—*Marheineke*:—How we may courageously meet every danger, when near to the Lord.—*Harms*:—This narrative a pictorial representation of the Christian life: The vessel which carries believers; the sea, or the world, with its tempest and waves, and the sufferings of the children of God; Christ asleep, or delaying His succor; then follow prayer, His rebuke, His word of command, and the exclamation of marvel.—*Hagenbach*:—Christ our refuge in the tempests of life.—*Greiling*:—The inner calm of the soul in the midst of the raging storm.—*Hüffell*:—God is always and everywhere near us.—*Krausold*:—Lord save! we perish! 1. The distress; 2. the cry for help; 3. the deliverance.

[*Alford*:—"The symbolic application of this occurrence (the calming of the tempest) is too striking to have escaped general notice. The Saviour with the company of His disciples in the ship tossed on the waves, seemed a typical reproduction of the ark bearing mankind on the flood, and a foreshadowing of the Church tossed by the tempests of this world, but having Him with her always. And the personal application is one of comfort and strengthening of faith in danger and doubt."—*Hilary*:—Those churches where the Word of God is not awake, are in danger of shipwreck, not that Christ sleeps, but He is slumbering in *us* by reason of *our* sleep. But where faith watches, there is no fear of wreck from the powers of this world.—P. S.]

IV.

Christ healing the demoniacs who profess His name; banished from Gadara; He restores the paralytic, and is accused of blasphemy,—or, the blessed working of the Lord despite the contradiction of the kingdom of darkness.

CHAPTER VIII. 28-34, IX. 1-8.

(*Ch. ix. 1–8 the Gospel for the 19th Sunday after Trinity.*—Parallels: Mark v. 1–20; Luke viii. 26–39; Mark ii. 1–12; Luke v. 17–26.)

28 And when he was [had] come to the other side, into the country of the Gergesenes
[Gadarenes],[1] there met him two possessed with devils, coming out of the tombs, exceeding fierce, so that no man [one] might [could, or was able to, ὥστε μὴ ἰσχύειν] pass
29 by that way. And, behold, they cried out, saying, What have we to do with thee,
30 Jesus,[2] thou Son of God? art thou come hither to torment us before the time? And
31 there was a good way off from them a herd of many swine feeding. So the devils
besought him, saying, If thou cast us out, suffer us to go away [send us away][3] into
32 the herd of swine. And he said unto them, Go. And when they were come out,
they went into the herd of swine [into the swine];[4] and, behold, the whole herd of
swine ran violently [rushed] down a steep place into the sea, and perished in the wa-
33 ters. And they that kept them [the herdsmen, οἱ βόσκοντες] fled, and went their ways
into the city, and told every thing, and what was befallen to [had befallen] the pos-
34 sessed of [with] the devils. And, behold, the whole city came out to meet Jesus; and
when they saw him, they besought *him* that he would depart out of their coasts [borders].
Ch. ix. 1 And he entered into a ship, and passed over, and came into his own city.
2 And, behold, they brought to him a man sick of the palsy, lying on a bed: and Jesus,
seeing their faith, said unto the sick of the palsy, Son, be of good cheer; thy sins be
3 [are] forgiven[5] thee. And, behold, certain of the scribes said within themselves, This
4 *man* blasphemeth. And Jesus, knowing[6] their thoughts, said, Wherefore think ye evil
5 in your hearts? For whether [which] is easier, to say, *Thy* sins be [are] forgiven thee;
6 or to say, Arise, and walk? But that ye may know that the Son of man hath power
on earth to forgive sins, (then saith he to the sick of the palsy,) Arise, take up thy
7 bed, and go[7] unto thine [to thy] house. And he arose, and departed to his house.

8 But when the multitudes saw *it*, they marvelled [feared][8], and glorified God, which [who] had given such power unto men.

[1] Ver. 28.—Γαδαρηνῶν according to B., C., M., al. Griesbach, Scholz, Tischendorf [Tregelles, Alford, Conant].—Γεργεσηνῶν C. codd. minusc., versions, Origen.—Γερασηνῶν, the ruling *lectio* at the time of Origen; several ancient versions, Lachmann. [Dr. Lange reads *Gadarenes*. Cod. Sinait.: γαζαρηνῶν. *See* Com.—]

[2] Ver. 29.—Ἰησοῦ is omitted in B., C., L. [Cod. Sinait.], etc. Borrowed from Mark v. 7; Luke viii. 28.

[3] Ver. 31.—Ἀπόστειλον ἡμᾶς, in Cod. B., [Cod. Sinait.], most of the versions, Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf [Tregelles, Alford, Conant]. The *lectio recepta*, ἐπίτρεψον ἡμῖν ἀπελθεῖν, is probably taken from Luke viii. 32, and explanatory.

[4] Ver. 32.—Εἰς τοὺς χοίρους, B., C., [Cod. Sinait.], Lachmann [for εἰς τὴν ἀγέλην τῶν χοίρων]. Probably taken from the parallel passages.

[5] Ch. ix., ver. 2.—[Ἀφέωνται is the indicative, either the present tense and equivalent to ἀφῶνται (as Homer uses ἀφέῃ for ἀφῇ), or more probably the perf. pass. (Doric form) for ἀφεῖνται, *remissa sunt*. Comp. Winer, *Grammat.*, etc., 6th Germ. ed., 1855, p. 74. Lachmann and Tregelles read ἀφίενται, *remittuntur*, with Cod. B., Cod. Sinait., and the Latin Vulgate.—P. S.]

[6] Ver. 4.—Lachmann, following B., M., reads εἰδώς instead of ἰδών of the Received Text.

[7] Ver. 6.—[Cod. Sinait. reads πορεύου for ὕπαγε.—P. S.]

[8] Ver. 8.—Ἐφοβήθησαν, *they feared*, is much better supported than ἐθαύμασαν, *they marvelled*. [It is sustained by the newly discovered Cod. Sinaiticus and adopted in all the modern critical editions, except the Gr. Test. of Stier, and Wordsworth who adhere to the Received Text.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 28. On the discussion about the readings, Γεργεσηνῶν, Γαδαρηνῶν, Γερασηνῶν, comp. the Commentaries.—Bleek (*Beiträge zur Evangelienkritik*, i. 26): "From Orig. (*in Joh.* Tom. vi. 24), we may infer with tolerable certainty, that, at the time of that Father, Γεργεσηνῶν was not found in any of the MSS. of the Gospels then current. He only mentions it as a conjecture, that this may have been an older reading. From that time it seems to have been introduced into manuscripts. Origen found that the common reading was Γερασηνῶν, that of Γαδαρηνῶν also occurring. The change of the former into the latter word is easily accounted for, but not the reverse. Hence the writer has always been of opinion, that Γερασηνῶν, which Lachmann also has adopted, is the correct reading in all the three Gospels. But as the town of *Gerasa*, in Arabia, could not possibly be meant, we suppose that the name was incorrectly written by the Evangelists, and that they probably meant the town of *Gergesa*, as Origen suggests." Accordingly, we drop the reading Γεργεσηνῶν, and only retain thus much, that Origen was *exegetically* right in maintaining that Jesus landed in the district of the Gergesenes, whose name at least (Γεργεσαῖοι, Gen. xv. 21; Deut. vii. 1; Josh. xxiv. 11) is mentioned by Josephus (*Ant.* i. 6, 2). But the MSS. are divided between the readings Gadara and Gerasa. Hence, judging from the circumstances of this narrative, we are warranted in fixing upon the adjoining Gadara, which was the capital of Peræa, rather than on the distant Gerasa, which lay on the eastern boundary of Peræa, and indeed was considered by some geographers to have been situate in Arabia. So also Winer and Meyer. Besides, the expulsion of the Lord is represented as an event of considerable importance, which would not have been the case had He been banished from Gerasa, and not from the capital of Peræa. Expulsion from a village by the sea-shore would only have induced Him to go farther inland; but banishment from the capital of the district rendered at least a temporary removal absolutely necessary. The pagan character of the district (swine, raging demons) may have led to the evangelical tradition, by which the scene of this narrative was transferred from Gadara to Gerasa. Gadara, the capital of Peræa (Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* iv. 8, 3), situated to the southeast of the southern end of the Lake of Gennesareth, south of the river Hieromax, sixty stadia from Tiberias, upon a mountain, inhabited chiefly by Gentiles (according to Seetzen and Burckhardt). It is supposed to have been the modern *Omkeis* (but comp. Ebrard, who places Gadara only one hour from the lake). See Winer and the Encyclops. and von Raumer's *Palestine*. On the eastern shore of the lake, comp. Ritter's *Palestine*. Ebrard suggests, that there had been a village called Gerasa in the neighborhood of Gadara. Euseb. *Onomasticon* refers to such a village under the article *Gergesa*, without, however, pronouncing decidedly on the point.

Two possessed with devils.—Mark and Luke speak only of one. Strauss and de Wette hold, that the account of Matthew is the authentic narrative; Weisse and others prefer that of Mark and Luke. Ebrard suggests, that Matthew joined the account of the possessed at Gadara with that in Mark i. 23; others fancy, that our Evangelist is in the habit of speaking of two individuals when there was only one. Meyer leaves the difficulty unsolved; while Augustine, Calvin, and Chrysostom suppose that one of the demoniacs is specially mentioned, as the principal personage and the greater sufferer. This idea is confirmed by the consideration, that two demoniacs would not have associated, unless the one had been dependent upon the other. For the details of the narrative, the parallel passages in the other Gospels must be consulted.

Coming out of the tombs.—This was their abode, the only one left them, after they had withdrawn from human supervision and society. We conjecture that they chose this haunt not merely from melancholy, but rather from a morbid craving for the terrible. These tombs were either natural or artificial caves in the rocks, or built in the ground. The calcareous mountain on which Gadara was situated, was specially suited for such sepulchres. Even Epiphanius (*adv. Hæres.* i. 131) mentions these rocky caves near Gadara, which were called πολυάνδρια and τύμβοι.

Ver. 29. **What have we to do with Thee?** מַה לָּנוּ וָלָךְ, 2 Sam. xvi. 10, etc. Grotius remarks *ad loc.*: "*Hoc si ex usu Latini sermonis interpreteris, contemtum videtur inducere. Ita enim Latini aiunt: Quid tibi mecum est? At Hebræis aliud significat,*

nimirum cur mihi molestiam exhibes?" * The ordinary consciousness of the demoniacs was always affected by, and mixed up with, their morbid consciousness. Hence their power of anticipation was morbidly developed. By virtue of this faculty they now recognized the Divine power and majesty of the Lord (comp. Luke iv. 34). Hence the question, whether πρὸ καιροῦ means: *before the judgment of the Messiah*, as de Wette and Meyer suppose. Perhaps they also anticipated that the work of Jesus in the district would be interrupted by them, and that it was not ready for the reception of the Messiah.

To torment us.—The apparent contradiction in the conduct of the demoniacs affords a striking confirmation of the truthfulness of this narrative. On the one hand, they seem to have felt the power of the Lord; they hastened to meet Him; their fierceness was kept in check, and they humbly entreated. But on the other hand, they identified themselves with the demons under whose power they were; they, so to speak, appeared as their representatives, and in that capacity complained that Jesus was about to torment them by healing the demoniacs,—*i. e.*, that He was about to send the demons to the place of torment. De Wette: "Torment us," by disturbing our stay and rule in man.

Ver. 30. **A herd of many swine.**—The Jews were prohibited from keeping swine, which were unclean animals (Lightfoot, 315; Eisenmenger, *Entdektes Judenthum*, i. 704). The herd must therefore have belonged to pagans, or else have been kept for purposes of traffic. In any case, it might serve as evidence of the legal uncleanness of the people, and of their essentially Gentile disposition.

Ver. 31. Probably the request was expressed in such terms as "**Send us,** ἀπόστειλον ἡμᾶς," but the assent of the Lord was couched in the form of a permission, or even of a sentence of banishment. Hence the other reading of the Received Text. The request shows that these demons were antinomian, not pharisaical; hence their choice of the swine. Possibly, there was also the malicious design latent, in this manner to put an end to the work of the Lord in the district. But in that case, the compliance of the Lord must be regarded as an evidence that at that time the awakening of terror was a sufficient effect. Lastly, the request of the demons implies that they were many (Meyer), which indeed is expressly mentioned in Mark and Luke.

Ver. 32. **Go,** ὑπάγετε.—The emphasis rests on the command *to go*. Strauss and others have raised an objection, on the ground that Jesus here interfered with the property of others. In reply, Ebrard appeals to the divinity and the absolute power of Christ. He also reminds us of the casting out of those who bought and sold in the temple; which, however, is scarcely a case in point, as every Jew might claim the right of reproving and opposing open and daring iniquity. Probably the conduct of Christ, in the case of so manifest a contravention of Mosaic ordinances, might be vindicated on the same ground, as simply the privilege of every zealous Israelite.† But the text does not oblige us to suppose that Jesus took any interference with the herd of swine. He neither administered justice, nor enforced police regulations, nor took oversight of the herds of swine of Gadara. His only object was to cure the demoniacs, which He did by commanding the demons simply *to go*. Other objections—such as, that the demons would have acted foolishly by driving the swine into the sea—are scarcely worth repeating. Any such difficulty would arise from the false assumption that demons can never be stupid. It must be admitted that certain morbid states, such as derangement of the nervous system, madness, idiocy, raving, etc., formed the natural substratum of demoniac possessions. Hence there is a marked difference between the possessed, and those who, like Judas and the Pharisees, voluntarily surrendered themselves to the power of evil, as there is also between the demons themselves, and Satan, or between the renunciation of Satan in Christian baptism, and exorcism,—a rite which originally was only applied in the case of the possessed, and only introduced into the ordinary ritual of baptism and confirmation of catechumens generally when spiritual knowledge was obscured in the Church. The demoniacs were destitute of freedom, not merely on account of the psychical ailment under which they labored, but because, while thus suffering, they were possessed by unclean spirits (πνεύματα ἀκάθαρτα). The idea of *bodily* possession, or the indwelling of the evil spirit in the physical frame of the diseased, was merely the popular notion. The main point was, that they were under the power of some special demoniac influence, or of a number of such influences, which proceeded from real demons, and were so strong, that the persons possessed identified themselves in their own minds with the demons, But it is quite possible that such influences may have proceeded not merely from the kingdom of Satan, in the narrowest sense, but also from the spirits of the departed. Hence Josephus (*De Bello Jud.* vii. 6, 3) held, that the demons were the spirits of wicked men; an opinion which was shared by some of the oldest of the Fathers, such as Justin Martyr and Athenagoras. Tertullian was the first to turn the current of opinion on the subject, and ultimately, on the authority of Chrysostom, the old idea of the spirits of departed and lost men was discarded, and that of devils adopted. But a closer inquiry into the character of sympathetic influences will show, that while the question, whence these demoniac influences proceeded, is of secondary importance, such influences—even to literal bodily possession—are quite possible, whether the party affected was conscious of them or not. From this it follows, that a demoniac might feel himself under the influence of a whole legion of unclean spirits, as, from the account in the other Gospels, appears to have been the case in the present instance. Hence we must beware of the common mistake, of putting the guilt of the demoniacs on the same level with that of wilful slaves of Satan. In our view, the blame attachable to such persons varied from the minimum, in the case of idiots, to a maximum. The common characteristic of all was

* [Comp. Comment. on John ii. 4, where Christ uses this phrase in speaking to His mother.—P. S.]

† [Dr. Alford thus disposes of this difficulty: "The destruction of the swine is not for a moment to be thought of in the matter, as if that were an act repugnant to the merciful character of our Lord's miracles. It finds its parallel in the cursing of the fig-tree (ch. xxi. 17–22); and we may well think that, if God has appointed so many animals daily to be slaughtered for the sustenance of men's bodies, He may also be pleased to destroy animal life when He sees fit for the liberation or instruction of their souls. Besides, if the confessedly far greater evil of the possession of *men* by evil spirits, and all the misery thereupon attendant, was permitted in God's inscrutable purposes, surely much more this lesser one. Whether there may have been special reasons in this case, such as the contempt of the Mosaic law by the keepers of the swine, we have no means of judging; but it is at least possible."—P. S.]

cowardice,—a cowardly surrender of a weakened and lowered consciousness to wicked influences. The same remarks apply to the moral aspect of madness generally; and we would adopt the idea, that all madness was connected with a kind of demoniac influence, rather than the view, that the demoniacs of Scripture were merely lunatics, or even that of older orthodox interpreters, who regarded them as a class of persons possessed by the devil,—God allowing it at the time of Christ, and then only, for the purpose of glorifying His name. We do not, however, deny, that at that period, when all human corruption had reached its climax, these demoniac possessions also appeared in a more full and patent manner. But if we consider that the evil primarily depended upon moral cowardice and non-resistance to evil, we shall understand all the better the method of cure adopted by the Lord. The thunderbolt of His power and divine rebuke would once more kindle the ray of life and strength in the soul, fill the spirits who possessed the demoniac with fear, and thus break the fetters by which they held their victims. It snapped, so to speak, the connection between the diseased mind, deprived of its freedom, and the demon; while at the same time the soul was brought under the influence of the Divine Being. Such was the deliverance from the δαίμων, who, although a personal being, is designated as δαιμόνιον, in allusion to the impersonality of the relationship.

They went into the herd of swine.—Of course the demons, not the demoniacs. The commotion in the herd, by which **they rushed down a steep place into the sea,** is readily accounted for from the well-known sympathy existing among gregarious animals. If one of the herd was seized with terror, all the others would be affected. Probably the horse is, of all animals, most liable to sudden fright, especially from spectral apparitions; but swine are also subject to such wild frights (comp. Scheitlin's *Thierseelenkunde*, vol. ii. 486). Perhaps the reason why swine were Levitically unclean, may have been not merely their outward conformation, but their susceptibility for impure psychical impressions. The circumstance, that the demons went into the swine, seems indeed mysterious; but the fright of these animals arose probably from the last terrible paroxysm, which ordinarily accompanied the healing of the possessed (Mark i. 26; Luke iv. 35; Mark ix. 26, etc.).

Ὁρμᾷν, *cum impetu ferri, irruere*, ch. xix. 29.—Olshausen suggests, that the demons drove down the herd; Henneberg, Neander, and others, that they were impelled by an unknown, but accidental cause; while Meyer regards this as a mythical addition. We prefer leaving it unexplained, as belonging to the mysterious connection between the world of spirit and nature.

Ver. 34. **The whole city.**—For the moment, the terror produced by this miracle proved even stronger than the indignation excited by the loss sustained. Accordingly, as the heathen were wont to go in solemn procession to the altars of the gods in order to avert calamities, so the people of Gadara went out to meet Christ, humbly beseeching Him to depart from their coasts. They evidently feared, lest, if He remained, they should sustain yet greater damage. The cure of two furious demoniacs, involving the loss of a herd of swine, appears a calamity in a district where swine have their keepers, but men are left uncared for. Jesus departs; but those who have been restored are left behind—more especially he who would fain have followed Him—to bear witness in Decapolis of the power and grace of Christ.

Chapter ix. vers. 1–8.—Luke (v. 17) and Mark (ii. 3) relate this history immediately after the cure of the leper. But this place belongs rather to the event connected with the centurion at Capernaum. Besides, the circumstance, that the scribes of Galilee now commenced their active opposition, proves that the chronological arrangement in Matthew is correct.

Ver. 1. **Into His own city.**—In the Greek: εἰς τὴν ἰδίαν πόλιν. Capernaum had the honor of bearing that name (iv. 13).

Ver. 2. A παραλυτικός. See Com. on ch. iv. 24.

Jesus seeing their faith.—This faith appeared more particularly in the bold plan which they adopted for bringing the sufferer into the presence of the Lord, as related by Mark and Luke. But while all shared that faith, the poor sufferer himself appears to have given the special directions. Paralytic, but healthy in soul,—a hero in faith on his sick-bed. Matthew indicates the extraordinary character of the circumstances by the expression: καὶ ἰδού.

Be of good cheer, θάρσει, τέκνον.—These two miracles afford an insight into the various methods by which the Lord restores those who are cowardly, and those who, strong in faith, are afflicted. In the one case, He rebukes; in the other, He comforts.—Τέκνον, an affectionate address; Mark ii. 5; x. 24; Luke xvi. 25. Analogous is θύγατερ, ver. 22.

Are forgiven thee, ἀφέωνταί σοι.—The perfect tense (Doric). Beza: *Emphasis minime negligenda.* In this instance the palsy must have been the consequence of the sin of the sufferer, though not in other cases, John ix. 3. That Christ with His unfailing penetration at once recognized and singled out these instances, showed how vastly different His judgment was from the prejudices of the people (Luke xiii. 4, and the account of Lazarus). Strauss vainly imagines that there is a contradiction between this and the other accounts about the Lord. Comp. against him the remarks of Meyer (note on p. 189), who, however, should not have denied that in the case before us the forgiveness of sins was both the *moral* and the *psychical* condition of restoration. It seems to us strange that de Wette should half concede the statement of Hase (in his *Leben Jesu*, § 73), who regards this history as an accommodation to popular prejudices.

Ver. 3. **And, behold, certain of the scribes.**—Before this, the scribes had not even in their thoughts charged the Lord with blasphemy. We have here a third evidence that Christ read the inmost thoughts of man. He traced the affliction of the palsied man to its secret origin in sin; He read the measures adopted by the palsied man, and by those who bore him, and traced them to faith; and He read the scribes, and descried their secret and blasphemous objections, that He was guilty of blasphemy, since God alone could forgive sins (Luke v. 21). Perhaps these feelings may have appeared in their countenances, as the Jews were wont to express their abhorrence of blasphemy in the strongest manner, even rending their garments and spitting when they deemed the prerogatives of God openly invaded. In the present instance, fear may have restrained such an open expression of what was marked in their faces and gestures. Hence de Wette is wrong in suggesting that the expression ἰδών in ver. 4 is "well explained by the reading εἰδώς" (after B., M.). Mark here correctly adds: τῷ πνεύματι. "To read the thoughts and dispositions of others (comp. John ii. 24,

25), was a characteristic of the expected Messiah (*see* Wetstein *ad loc.*). In virtue of being the Son of God, Jesus possessed this power, which may be considered analogous to that of working miracles."—Meyer. But we must not forget the vast difference between the notion of a *magical* reading of thoughts, which the rabbins entertained, and the Divine-human introspect of Christ, which in every instance was occasioned by some mark overlooked by others, but patent to the Master.

Ver. 4. **Wherefore think ye evil?**—Olshausen: *Evil*, because they failed to understand His Divine character. De Wette: On account of their hasty, malevolent, and light judgment. Comp. Matt. xii. 31. Their thoughts were evil in themselves, because they regarded the highest life as a blasphemy, and also because they expressed not openly their scruples. Hence ὑμεῖς, in opposition to those who confided in Him. Probably they chiefly objected to this, that Christ seemed to abolish the arrangements of the temple, by which the priest typically forgave sins on offering the sacrifice appointed by the law. It is absurd to interpret the expression used by the Lord as a *mere announcement* of forgiveness of sins (Kuinoel).

Ver. 5. **Which is easier?**—*i. e.*, In truth, both are equally difficult, and presuppose Divine power and authority. But, as the full effect of His absolution could not be patent to the outward senses, He accords a visible confirmation of it by a miracle.*

Ver. 6. **But that ye may know, Arise.**—The Evangelist purposely omits to indicate the change of persons addressed,† in order to make it more pictorial. "*That ye may know that power has the Son of Man* (power is put first by way of emphasis) *on earth* (in opposition to heaven) *to forgive sins, Arise,*" etc. For other details, *see* the account in Mark and Luke.

Ver. 8. **They were afraid** (in the authorized version, **marvelled**), ἐφοβήθησαν.—Those who witnessed the occurrence experienced a spiritual conflict—the Spirit of Christ contending in their hearts with the unbelief of the scribes. In these circumstances, the miracle of healing proved all the more quickening, that the gracious working of Christ in the face of this opposition implied a greater manifestation of power.

Such power unto men.—Grotius and Kuinoel apply this simply to Jesus, regarding ἀνθρώποις as the plural of category. Baumgarten-Crusius explains it: Such power to men for their salvation through Christ. Meyer and de Wette: A new gift of God to humanity. But the expression referred especially to the ἐξουσία of forgiving sins. This power, which hitherto had been enthroned in the most holy place as the prerogative of Jehovah, now stood embodied before them, as it were an incarnate Shechinah. Hence their joyous expression: He has given it to the Son of Man, and therefore to men. The explanations of Kuinoel and Meyer are not contradictory.*

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. These two miracles have this in common, that they were accomplished under exceedingly difficult circumstances. In the first instance, the coöperation of receptive faith was entirely wanting. The only germ present was that awe with which the demons owned the power and supremacy of Christ; while, on the other hand, the Saviour had to contend not only with the demoniacal spirit, but with the impure and grovelling disposition of the Gadarenes. In the second miracle, the unbelief of the Pharisees and scribes formed a counterpoise to the faith of the palsied man, and of those who brought him forward. Add to this, that the first cure was followed by expulsion from Gadara, and the second by a secretly harbored reproach of blasphemy on the part of the scribes, which was fully expressed on a later occasion (Matt. xii. 24).

2. The two miracles are still further connected by the peculiar view of Christ which they present. More than in any other instance in which He healed the possessed, does the Lord here appear as the Mighty One—as conqueror not only of demons, but also of the dark and hostile powers of pagan or semi-pagan countries; while, in the second miracle, we see Him penetrating to the root of evil, to sin, and removing the moral power of consciousness of guilt. His saving grace extends to the lowest psychological and moral abyss of human misery. Combining these two miracles with that of calming the tempest, we behold Christ as the Lord over nature, over the powers of darkness, and over the depths of the human heart.

3. The cure of the demoniacs at Gadara may be regarded as forming the central-point of biblical demonology. It is also an explanation and defence of the legal prohibition of swine-flesh under the Old Covenant. But Lisco and Gerlach go too far in maintaining that the destruction of the herd was intended as a punishment. Jesus only *permits* it at the request of the demoniacs, who have not yet completely recovered, and hence are not quite under His pow-

* [Dr. Trench, *Notes on the Miracles of our Lord*, 6th ed., Lond., 1858, p. 206 sq., correctly observes: "In our Lord's argument it must be carefully noted that He does not ask, 'Which is easiest, to forgive sins, or to raise a sick man?' for it could not be affirmed that that of forgiving was easier than this of healing; but, 'Which is easiest, to *claim* this power or to *claim* that; to *say*, Thy sins be forgiven thee, or to *say*, Arise and walk?' And He then proceeds: 'That is easiest, and I will now prove my right to say it, by saying with effect and with an outward consequence setting its seal to my truth, the harder word, '*Rise up and walk.*' By doing that which is submitted to the eyes of men, I will attest my right and power to do that which, in its very nature, lies out of the region of proof. By these visible tides of God's grace I will give you to know in what direction the great under-currents of His love are setting, and that those and these are alike obedient to my word. From this which I will now do openly and before you all, you may conclude that it is no 'robbery' (Phil. ii. 6) upon my part to claim also the power of forgiving men their sins.' Thus, to use a familiar illustration of our Lord's argument, it would be easier for a man, equally ignorant of French and Chinese, to claim to know the last than the first; not that the language itself is easier, but that, in the one case, multitudes could disprove his claim; and in the other, hardly a scholar or two in the land."—P. S.]

† [This change is indicated by the parenthetic words of the Evangelist: τότε λέγει τῷ παραλυτικῷ. The regular construction would require either εἰδῶσιν for εἰδῆτε, or λέγω for τότε λέγει.—P. S.]

* [Alford: "Τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, *to mankind.* They regarded this wonder-working as something by God granted to men—to mankind; and without supposing that *they* had before them the full meaning of their words, those words were true in the very highest sense. *See* John xvii. 8."—Trench, *On Miracles*, p. 209: "They felt rightly that what was given to one man, to the Man Christ Jesus, was given for the sake of all, and ultimately *to* all, that it was indeed given '*unto men;*' they felt, that He possessed these powers as the true Head and Representative of the race, and therefore that these gifts to Him were a rightful subject of gladness and thanksgiving for every member of that race."—P. S.]

er. Nor must we forget that, despite their own impurity, the demoniacs commonly possessed in increased measure a clear sense of what was unseemly (comp. Acts xix. 15). The demons chose to enter into the swine. The demoniacs also chose to bring an ironical punishment on their district, and thus to vent their last paroxysm in a direction more wholesome than formerly.—Lastly, the Lord Himself regarded this judgment as wholly suitable, without, however, having directly sent it.

4. The absolution of the palsied man, and later instances of the same kind, were in some respects an anticipation of the moment when the veil in the temple was rent in twain. Such seems also to have been the unconscious feeling of those who were present at the time. This history forcibly presents to our view the connection between sin and misery, between forgiveness and recovery, and hence also between justification and the resurrection.

[5. The power of forgiving sins is a strictly *Divine* privilege, as the Jews rightly supposed, and could be claimed by Christ only on the ground of His Divine nature. Hence we may use this claim as an argument for the Divinity of the Saviour (as Athanasius did against the Arians). Yet He claimed and exercised this power as the *incarnate* Son of God, or as the Son of *Man on earth*, having brought it with Him from heaven, as the one who is at once like unto us, and above us all as the crown and perfection of humanity. While on earth, He exercised the power directly and personally; after His exaltation He exercises it in His Church as His organ through the means of grace, and the ministry of reconciliation. Hence He conferred this power, commonly called the *power of the keys*, *i. e.*, the power of discipline in receiving and excluding members, and thus opening and shutting the gates of the kingdom of heaven, upon His apostles (Matt. xvi. 19; xviii. 18), who in this case speak and act in the name and by the authority of Christ. The Church does the works of heaven on earth ("*facit in terris opera cœlorum*"), and binds and looses, but only by a *committed*, not an inherent power, and only as the organ of Christ. Comp. Trench, *Notes on Mir.*, p. 207, and Wordsworth *in Matt.* ix. 6: "Christ forgives sins not only as God, by His omnipotence, but as *Son of Man;* because He has united man's nature to His own, and in that nature has fulfilled the law and perfected obedience, and so merited to receive all *power on earth* (Matt. xxviii. 18) in that nature; which power He now exercises as Mediator, and will continue to exercise, till all enemies . . are put under His feet. As *Son of Man*, He ever exercises this power of forgiving sin on *earth*, by means of the Word and Sacraments, and by the Ministry of Reconciliation (2 Cor. v. 18, 19), and by whatever appertains to what is called 'the Power of the Keys.' . . . Besides, by saying that sins are forgiven 'upon *earth*,' our Lord reminds us that *after death* there is no more place for repentance and forgiveness, for then the door is shut." A false inference. The contrast is not between *earth* and *eternity*, but between *earth* and *heaven*.—P. S.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Jesus encounters the contradiction and enmity of the world, not only in His teaching, but also in His works of grace and power.—The glory of Christ's miracles appears in this, that they are performed in the midst of unbelievers, if He only meet with a grain of faith in those who apply to Him for help.—Jesus must pluck as brands from the burning those whom He redeems from the unbelief of the world.—Christ's casting out the unclean spirits, as connected with His forgiveness of sins.

The history of the Gadarenes.—Jesus makes a way for His own both by sea and by land.—The insecurity of highways an indication of the state of a country.—Connection between human raving and the spirits of darkness.—Internal contradiction on the part of those who were possessed: 1. They hasten reverently to meet the Lord, and yet complain that He would torment them; 2. they betake themselves to entreaty, and yet display malice; 3. they are themselves cured, and yet become burdensome to others.—The possessed gave a more suitable reception to the Lord than the people of Gadara.—The proximity of the Holy One rendering uneasy and tormenting not only open and wilful sinners, but also those who are deprived of their moral freedom.—It is easier for Christ to heal the raving of maniacs than to remove calculating and yet stupid selfishness.—The *Divine judgment* accompanying the cure: a trial of the country and people.—The expulsion of the Lord, under the guise of reverence, and in the form of an entreaty, notwithstanding the ceremony of a procession come out to meet Him.

The cure of the Paralytic, ch. ix. 1–8.—The Lord reading the secrets of the heart: 1. He descries in the urgent endeavors of felt need, the faith which prompts them, and brings it to maturity; 2. He descries in the misery the guilt which was its cause, and removes not only the misery, but also its root; 3. He descries the secret unbelief of the heart, and obviates its pernicious influences.—The miracle on the conscience and the miracle on the sick life are always combined: 1. The former is the root; the latter, the manifestation. 2. The one or the other may, indeed, be more apparent; but 3. the miracle on the life cannot prove lasting without that on the conscience, while that on the conscience is manifested by that on the life.—This miracle on the palsied man revealing the fullest measure of grace of all the cures accomplished by Christ.—*Son, be of good cheer; thy sins be forgiven thee.*—*The Son of Man has power on earth to forgive sins.*—Christ will manifest in the bodies of His people what He has done for their souls.—The gospel of free grace confirmed by visible signs before the eyes of His opponents: 1. By the recovery of nations; 2. by the flourishing condition of countries; 3. by the tokens of a coming resurrection all over the earth.—The scribes and priests of the law forgiving sins, and Jesus forgiving sins: 1. The former connected with outward ordinances, sacrifices, and the services of the temple, typical in its nature and arrangements; 2. the latter proceeding from free grace, received by faith, and manifested in a new life.—The outward evidence of secret grace.—The gospel of the forgiveness of sins by Christ, the most glorious gift of God to man.—What God gave to Christ, He gave through Him to men.

Starke:—The devils also believe and tremble, James ii. 19.—*Zeisius:*—If the devil cannot have his will, it is a torment to him; so also with his children, the wicked.—*Osiander:*—They who only seek to do harm are certainly Satan's children, John viii. 44.—*Hedinger:*—Now-a-days, also, the devil enters into the swine.—God sometimes deprives us of our outward possessions: 1. In compassion; 2. in righteousness. *Quesnel.*—*Hedinger:*—What ingratitude to retain the swine and to banish Christ!—It is one of Satan's devices to represent the gospel as causing

loss.—They who banish Christ in His members are worse than the Gadarenes.—*Ch.* ix. 1–8. *Hedinger:* —It is our duty to succor our neighbor in his distress.—When laid on a bed of sickness, we ought to be more anxious for the health of the soul than for that of the body.—True faith receives from the hand of God what it sought.—He who from the heart repents and believes on Christ has forgiveness, Acts x. 43.—Jesus reading the thoughts and intents of the heart, John ii. 25.—It is impossible to be happy or comfortable if we are not assured that we are God's children.—Each miracle of power or of grace the earnest of another.—Forgiveness of sins comprehends every blessing.—*Quesnel:*—What is felt a stumbling-block by the worldly-wise, is an occasion to the simple to praise God.—Admiration and praise must go together.

Gerlach:—Those who hate Me love death, Prov. viii. 36.—Miracles are but the anticipation and earnest of a higher order of things. Hence, as under the Old, so under the New dispensation, Jesus occasionally manifested Himself in His miracles as the future Judge of the world.—But this was not the main object of His miracles, which, in general, were the manifestation of His love, and performed by Him as Redeemer.—Miracles of judgment: this instance (?); the money-changers, and those who bought and sold in the temple (?); the unfruitful fig-tree; terror struck into the company of those who came out to take Him. (Ananias and Sapphira, Elymas.)—In this instance also, blessing and judgment were conjoined: 1. Safety restored to the district; 2. the neighborhood delivered from evil spirits; 3. the possessed cured; 4. the attraction of a prohibited enjoyment removed.—*Ch.* ix. 1–8. A special emphasis rests on the name, "*Son of Man*," as signifying the Messiah or the Saviour, as man among men.—Jesus has bestowed upon His servants authority to announce to sinners forgiveness of sin in the name of God.

Heubner (on ch. ix. 1–8):—Even the faith of others may aid us in obtaining forgiveness of sins.—Christianity has, directly and indirectly, a beneficial influence on bodily ailments.—Consciousness of sin is the sting in all our bodily sufferings.—Forgiveness is the first thing which man requires in his misery.—Christ always addresses to afflicted souls the words, "*Be of good cheer.*"—The common proverb, that thoughts are free, is essentially untrue.—Common tendency to suspicion.—The deliverance of others should be matter of joy to us.—The healing of the paralytic: 1. How Jesus begins it; 2. how He defends it; 3. how He completes it.—The power of Christ to forgive sins: 1. Wherein it consists; 2. its condition.

Reinhard, 1802.—The forgiveness of sins has the most beneficial influence also upon the consequences of our transgressions.—*Harms:*—The connection between sin and suffering: 1. Generally patent; 2. sometimes hidden; 3. always certain.—*Westermeyer:*—The power of Jesus to forgive sins on earth: 1. The contradiction against it; 2. the testimonies for it; 3. its glory; 4. its conditions. *Sachse:*—Christ the true Physician of the soul. *Ranke:*—The power of Christ to forgive sins.—*C. Beck:*—Christ knows how to save truly: 1. He looks to the ground; 2. He heals from the ground.—*Höpfner:*—Christ at the sick-bed.—*Fuchs:*—The blessing of sickness.—*H. Müller:*—I believe the forgiveness of sins.

V.

The miracle of the call of Matthew to the Apostolate; the feast of the Lord with the publicans; twofold stumblingblock of the Pharisees and disciples of John: or, Christ's gracious working *despite the contradiction of legal piety.*

Chapter IX. 9–17 (Mark ii. 13–22; Luke v. 27–39).

9 And as Jesus passed forth [on] from thence, he saw a man, named Matthew, sitting at the receipt of custom [custom-house]: and he saith unto him, Follow me. And
10 he arose, and followed him. And it came to pass, as Jesus sat at meat [reclined at table] in the house, behold, many publicans[1] and sinners came and sat down [reclined]
11 with him and his disciples. And when the Pharisees saw *it*, they said unto his dis-
12 ciples, Why eateth your master with publicans and sinners? But when Jesus[2] heard *that*, he said unto them, They that be [are] whole need not a physician, but they that
13 are sick. But go ye and learn what *that* meaneth, I will have mercy, and not sacrifice: for I am not come to call the righteous[3], but sinners to repentance.[4]
14 Then came to him the disciples of John, saying, Why do we and the Pharisees fast
15 oft [often], but thy disciples fast not? And Jesus said unto them, Can the children of the bridechamber mourn, as long as the bridegroom is with them? but the days[5] will come, when the bridegroom shall be taken from them, and then shall they fast.
16 No man putteth a piece [patch] of new [unwrought] cloth unto [on] an old garment;[6] for that which is put in to fill it up taketh from the garment, and the rent is made
17 worse. Neither do men put new wine into old [skin-] bottles: else the bottles break

[the skins burst], and the wine runneth out, and the [skin-] bottles perish:[7] but they put new wine into new [skin-] bottles, and both are preserved [together].[8]

[1] Ver. 10.—[*Publicans* for τελῶναι is better than *taxgatherers* which has been suggested by some as more intelligible. For, as Dr. Conant correctly remarks, a *taxgatherer* is not necessarily a *publican*, though a *publican* is a *taxgatherer*. The term *publican* is as much established in Scriptual usage, as the terms *Pharisee*, *Sadducee*, *scribe*, *Baptist*, etc. It suggests the oppressive system of taxation in the old Roman empire and the arbitrary exaction and fraud connected with it. The taxes were sold by the Roman government to the highest bidders, who gave security for the sum to be paid to the state, and were allowed to collect from the provinces as much as they could beyond it, for their own benefit and that of their numerous agents and subagents.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 12.—Ἰησοῦς is omitted in Cod. B. [also in Cod. Sinait.] and in some translations. According to Meyer it was inserted from the parallel passages.

[3] Ver. 13.—[Dr. Lange omits the article before *righteous*, according to the Greek. The art. would seem to imply that there are really righteous persons; while there are such only in their own conceit. Dr. Conant omits the art., and translates: *righteous men*.—P. S.]

[4] Ver. 13.—Εἰς μετάνοιαν is wanting in Cod. B., D., L., [Cod. Sinait.], in several translations and fathers. Comp. Luke v. 32.

[5] Ver. 15.—[*Days*, ἡμέραι, without the article. So also Lange: *Es werden aber Tage kommen*. Cod. Sinait. omits the words: ἐλεύσονται δὲ ἡμέραι, ὅθαν ἀπαρθῇ ἀπ' αὐτῶν ὁ νυμφίος.—P. S.]

[6] Ver. 16.—[Dr. Lange: *Niemand flickt einen Lappen von ungewalktem Zeug auf ein altes Kleid*, i. e., *a patch of unfulled cloth on an old garment*, which is more literal.]

[7] Ver. 17.—Lachmann, following B. and other Codd. [among which must be mentioned now the Cod. of Mt. Sinai] reads ἀπόλλυνται [instead of ἀπολοῦνται].

[8] Ver. 17.—[*Preserved together*, συντηροῦνται; Lange: "*miteinander* erhalten."—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 9. On the identity between **Matthew** and **Levi**, comp. the Introduction; Mark ii. 14; Luke v. 27. Probably Matthew had already, at a former period, entered into closer relationship with the Lord.

Ἐπὶ τὸ τελώνιον.—The place where custom was levied, *toll-house*, *custom-house*, *collector's office*. His way led Him past the receipt of custom (παράγων).

Ver. 10. **As Jesus sat**, better: **lay**, or **reclined, at table in the house**—according to Eastern custom. It was the practice to recline on divans, resting upon the left arm. The house, which is here designated with the article, was, no doubt, that of the publican. Meyer maintains that it was the house of Jesus,* since we read in the former verse that Matthew followed Him, as if to follow the Lord meant to accompany Him across the street! Luke relates that the feast took place in the house of Levi (Matthew). We cannot see any difficulty, unless, like Fritzsche and Meyer, we were to take in its gross literality an expression which evidently means, that from that moment Matthew followed Christ as His *disciple* in the narrowest sense. De Wette correctly remarks that it is not likely that Christ ever gave dinner-parties.†

And sinners.—Meyer: Worthless persons generally (!). We should rather say, in general, those whom the Pharisees had excommunicated from the synagogues.

Ver. 12. **The whole—the sick,**—*i. e.*, according to ver. 13, the righteous and sinners. De Wette supposes that the former referred to persons who were really righteous in the Jewish and legal sense; while Meyer takes it ironically, as applying to their boasted righteousness. We would combine the two ideas. They imagined that they were righteous, regarding legal righteousness as sufficient before God. On the other hand, those who in the text are called sinners, were not merely such from the Jewish point of view, but felt themselves guilty when brought in contact with the righteousness of Christ. Most aptly, therefore, does Calvin designate this as an *ironica concessio*.

Ver. 13. **I will have mercy.**—*I take pleasure, I desire.* Hosea vi. 6, after the Septuagint. The opinion of de Wette, that the term חֶסֶד, in Hosea, means piety, is ungrounded.—**And not sacrifice.** The comparison may be relative; but when mercy and sacrifice are placed in opposition to each other, it becomes absolute, because the sacrifice then loses all its value, and becomes an act of hypocrisy. The expression, πορευθέντες μάθετε, **go and learn**, answers to the rabbinical formula, צֵא וּלְמַד. Schöttgen.

Ver. 14. **The disciples of John**, etc.—St. Luke represents the Pharisees as in this case also urging the objection, and Schleiermacher considers this the authentic version of the event. De Wette regards the narrative of Luke as a correction upon Matthew, and deems it improbable that the disciples of John should have come forward as here related. Meyer decides simply in favor of the account of Matthew. Luke may have represented the Pharisees as putting the question proposed by the disciples of John, because the latter shared many of the views of the Pharisees, and were in danger of going further in that direction, from their attachment to John and to his asceticism. These were the disciples of John who would not be guided by their master's direction to the Lamb of God.

Ver. 15. **The children of the bride-chamber**, οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ νυμφῶνος.—On the day of marriage, the bridegroom went, adorned and anointed, to the house of the bride, attended by his companions (מֵרֵעִים, Judges xiv. 11), and led her, attended by her maidens, in festive procession, with music and dancing, at even, by torchlight, into the house of his father. The marriage feast, which was defrayed by the bridegroom, lasted seven days. (*See* the Bibl. Encyclops. sub *Marriage*.)

Mourn.—The Lord here indicates that fasting must be the result of πενθεῖν. The other Evangelists have νηστεύειν. "Fasting should be the expression

* [Meyer means, of course, the house in which Jesus dwelt at the time. For from Matt. viii. 20; Luke ix. 58, it is evident that Christ had no house of his own.—P. S.]

† [It is due to Meyer to remark that he treats this objection as gratuitous, since the Evangelist, he thinks, speaks only of an ordinary meal of Jesus with His disciples. But whence the "*many* publicans and sinners," who took part in it?—P. S.]

of sorrow; not merely an outward exercise, but the expression of an inward state." De Wette. The primary object of our Lord, therefore, was to show the impropriety of those fasts which had no proper motive, and hence were untrue. The present was the festive season for the disciples; and it was theirs to show this by their outward gladness. "The Roman Catholics infer from this verse, that, since the death of Christ, it is necessary to fast." Heubner. If this were to be consistently carried out, we should have to fast the whole year round.

Ver. 16. **No man putteth a patch of unwrought** [or *unfulled*] **cloth.**—Two similes taken from common life to illustrate the principles of the Divine economy. In both cases, it is not so much the unsuitableness of adding the new to the old which is brought out, as the folly of bringing together what is not only new, but *fresh*, with that which is not only old, but *antiquated*. Hence, in the first example, we have not only a piece of new cloth, but of raw and unwrought material, which will shrink. Accordingly, the piece inserted **to fill it up** (πλήρωμα) will make the rent worse by the strain upon the old cloth. Similarly, the new wine which is still fermenting, expands, and will thus burst the old skin bottles. The antagonism between the old and the new arises, therefore, not merely from the imperfectness of the old, but also from that of the new, which, however, from its inherent nature, must develop and expand. An arrangement of this kind were, therefore, not merely unsuitable, but even destructive,—making matters worse, instead of improving them. The result in both cases would be, that the old and the new would perish together. A careful examination shows that the two similes are intended to supplement each other. The first meets the case of the disciples of John, with whom the old was the principal consideration, and the new only secondary; *i. e.*, they regarded Christianity merely as a reformation of the Old Covenant, as a piece of new cloth to fill up a rent in the old garment. The second simile applies more especially to the disciples of Jesus. Here, Christianity is the primary consideration (the new wine from the Vine of Israel), whilst the old forms of the theocracy were secondary. In both cases, the result is the same. But, besides its special lessons, the second simile is also intended to show how entirely false the view alluded to in the first simile was, that Christianity was only a piece of new cloth to mend the torn garment of the old theocracy.

Ver. 17. **Bottles,** or lit.: **skins,** ἀσκοί.—In the East, water, milk, wine, oil, and similar commodities, were, and are still, preserved and transported in leathern bottles, which were commonly made of the hides of goats, rarely of camels, and asses. The exterior of the skin, after having been suitably prepared, was generally used as the interior of the bottle. *See* the quotations of Heubner (p. 128) from Lucian and Aulus Gellius.*

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. It is important to study the external and internal connection between the call of the publican to the apostolate, and the commencement of open hostility to the gracious forgiveness of sins by Jesus on the part of the Pharisees. *When they who had a historical claim upon the Gospel rejected its provisions, they were offered to those who had a spiritual claim upon the glad tidings, by being prepared and ready to receive them.* Christ, the Saviour of sinners, reviled by the Pharisees, turns to the publicans, and calls one of their number to the apostolic office. Thus, at a later period, the hostility of the scribes and Pharisees of Jerusalem led to His entering a heathen country, when He passed into the territory of Tyre and Sidon, there to display His grace in the case of the Syrophenician woman, Matt. xv. In an analogous manner, also, the Lord interpreted the Old Testament narratives concerning Elijah and the heathen widow of Sarepta, and Elisha and Naaman the Syrian (Luke iv. 25, etc.). The conduct of Paul was precisely similar. When the Jews in their unbelief rejected the Gospel, he turned to the Gentiles (Acts xiii. 46; xviii. 6). Hence, while the conversion of the publican was a grand sign that the Lord now turned to the outcasts, the call of Matthew to the apostolate was a miracle of grace.

2. The quotation of Christ from the prophecies of Hosea, is generally adduced as expressing the contrast between the New Covenant and the degenerate form which the Old had assumed. Similarly, it may be applied to the contrast between Evangelical Protestant Christianity and the secularized mediæval Church. Nor are we, perhaps, mistaken in tracing a like difference between a devout and living piety and a fanatical orthodoxy, which too often contravenes the demands of the heart, and is radically opposed to Christian humanity.

3. Perhaps the circumstances in which John the Baptist was placed, may in part account for the gloomy disposition of his disciples. For some time past John had been in prison, and they looked to Jesus for help in this emergency; nor could they understand how, in the meantime, He could take part in festive entertainments.

4. It is significant, that even at that period the objections of the disciples of John were allied to those of the Pharisees. But there was this difference between them, that while the latter questioned the *disciples*, as if to turn them from their Master, the followers of John addressed themselves directly to the *Master Himself*. Even in their case, however, we miss that full παῤῥησία which should characterize the Christian. They do not venture to blame Christ openly. The Pharisees had questioned *the disciples*, "Why eateth your *Master?*" etc.; while the disciples of John ask the *Master*, "Why do Thy *disciples* fast not?" Fanaticism assumes only the appearance of παῤῥησία, especially when, kindled by the sympathy of an excited majority, it is arrayed against a minority. Then those flaming declamations of self-satisfied eloquence burst forth, which the multitude regard as the voice of an archangel, while they are utterly opposed to that deep calm engendered by the Spirit of adoption, who inspires even a weak minority to speak with παῤῥησία. Finally, this occurrence seems to form the turning-point in history at which the later disciples of John separated from their teacher. The difference, which was afterward fully established, continues even to this day.

5. The reply of the Lord to the disciples of John contains a canon perpetually binding, in respect of the relation between form and substance. The prin-

* [Comp. also Dr. Robinson, *Bibl. Researches*, ii., p. 440, and Dr. Hackett, *Illustrations of Scripture from Eastern Travel*, pp. 44–46, who tells us that he met these skin-bottles, or bags made of the skins of animals for holding water, wine, and other liquids in the houses, and transporting them on journeys, at Cairo at almost every turn in the streets, and everywhere in Egypt and Syria. It was a 'water-skin' (according to the Hebrew) which Abraham placed on the shoulder of Hagar, when he sent her forth into the desert (Gen. xxi. 14).—P. S.]

ciple itself has never been sufficiently appreciated. Even Master Philip [Melanchthon] seemed always prone to put the new wine of Gospel truth into the old bottles. The same attempt was made at a later period by the Jansenists, and gave rise to the tragic history of the *Port Royal*. In our own days, also, some seem still to be of opinion that the unwrought cloth may be put upon the old garment, and the new wine be preserved in decaying bottles. "The warning of Christ applies to all times, that the life of His Church is not to be surrendered by forcing it into antiquated forms. But it also implies that genuine Christian forms should be preserved, along with the truth which they convey."

6. "The reply of Jesus to His disciples appears the more striking, when we remember the last testimony of the Baptist concerning Him." He that has the bride is the bridegroom: but the friend of the bridegroom, who standeth and heareth him, rejoiceth greatly because of the bridegroom's voice (John iii. 29). Jesus seems only to continue and to follow up the speech of their master when He replied to John's disciples: "Can the friends of the bridegroom mourn and fast, so long as the bridegroom is with them?" Lastly, the Lord here points forward to His future sufferings and death as a period for inward fasting. This fasting, which is to succeed the sufferings and death of Christ, consists in a complete renunciation of the world.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Jesus goes to all classes, into all streets, and to all men.—The greatness of Divine grace, which can make of a publican an Apostle. 1. According to Jewish traditionalism, the publican was an excommunicated person; but he is now called to assist in founding the communion of Christ. 2. He was an apostate from the people of God, but called to become one of the pillars of the Church of God. 3. An instrument of oppression, but becomes an instrument of glorious liberty. 4. A stumblingblock and a byeword, but becomes a burning and a shining light.—Grace is not stopped by any customhouse, and pays no toll.—High call of the Lord to the publican, and great faith of the publican in the Lord.—Matthew the Apostle relates, to the glory of God, that he had formerly been a publican.—The publican and the Apostle.—The Divine call must determine us to relinquish an ambiguous occupation.—Strange circumstance, that the Lord and His disciples should sit down at meat with publicans and sinners. 1. How can this be? Because the Lord does not conform to the publicans and sinners, but they to Him. He not only continues the Master, but becomes theirs. 2. What does it convey to our minds? Infinite compassion, manifesting itself in full self-surrender, despite difficulties and objections.—Christ and His disciples are still at meat with publicans and sinners.—When the Pharisees saw it, they said, *Why?* How this question has ever since been reiterated in the history of the Eucharist (Novatianism; refusal of the cup; Eucharistic Controversy).—The reply of Jesus, "They that be whole need not a physician, but they that are sick:" 1. A calm exposition: they that are whole are really whole, and they that are sick, really sick, in the legal sense. 2. A solemn warning: they that are whole are sick unto death, because they deem themselves whole; while a sense of their spiritual sickness renders the others capable of life. 3. A decisive judgment: salvation is for sinners who feel their need, not for the self-righteous.—Eternal import of the saying, "I will have mercy, and not sacrifice." 1. Rather mercy than sacrifice, if the two be put in *comparison;* 2. only mercy and not sacrifice, if the two are put in *antagonism;* 3. mercy exclusively, to the rejection of sacrifice, if the one is set up in *contradiction* to the other.—Mercy the most acceptable and holy sacrifice.—Sacrifices, to the exclusion of mercy, not offerings, but robbery.—Sad conflict between mercy and sacrifice, throughout the course of history.—Lessons derived from the declaration of Jesus, "I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance:" 1. Character and prospects of the sinners who listen to the call of Jesus. 2. Character of the religion which ignores Christ and His pardon.—Inquiry of the disciples of John, or characteristics of the legalist: 1. He would give laws to others as well as to himself; 2. he would give laws without heeding the requirements of the case; 3. he is ready to take the part of the worst legalism ("we and the Pharisees"), and to assail with his puny objections the holiest liberty ("but Thy disciples fast not").—Arrogance of legalism: 1. The disciples of the Baptist assume the place of being the masters of the Lord; 2. they venture to censure Him according to the traditions of their school; 3. they adduce the Pharisees as authorities against Christ Himself.—The bridal and the mourning season of the disciples: 1. Wherein each consists; 2. the appropriate manifestation of each.—It is one of the first principles of true Christianity, that every outward manifestation must proceed from an inward state.—The Christian life a continuous marriage feast, which may be interrupted, but is not broken up, by the sufferings of this present world.—Christ the Bridegroom of the Church: 1. As such He came at first; 2. as such He went away; 3. as such He will return.—Sad mistakes in the kingdom of God, which can only entail harm: 1. To mend that which is antiquated by putting on it a piece of new cloth; 2. by forcing the new life into antiquated forms. Or, 1. To garnish legalism with the gospel; 2. to force the gospel into the forms of legalism.—All attempts at patching unavailing.—The law and the gospel cannot be mixed up: 1. Because the gospel is infinitely more strict than the law (the unwrought piece shrinks); 2. because it is infinitely more free than the law (the new wine bursts the mouldering bottles).—Hierarchism might learn many a lesson from those who patch, and from those who cultivate the vine.—The sentence of Christ upon ecclesiastical questions: 1. New cloth, a new garment; 2. new wine, new bottles.—The true principles of genuine ecclesiastical conservatism.—Above all, we must aim to preserve, 1. the life along with the forms; and then, 2. the forms with the life.—Consequences of false conservatism in the Church: 1. These attempts at tailoring in spiritual matters are opposed even to common sense and everyday practice. 2. The old forms are destroyed by the new life, and the new life by the old forms. 3. The work of destruction is continued while they clamor against destruction, until the new and the old are finally separated.—How the Lord prepares the wedding garment and the new wine for the kingdom of God.—The threefold mark of the new life: 1. It assumes a definite outward form; 2. it cannot continue in the false and antiquated forms; 3. it must create for itself corresponding forms.

Starke:—Christ is not ashamed of the greatest sinners.—*Osiander:*—It is easier to convert open

sinners than hypocrites. This is more difficult than to break through a mountain of iron.—Christ the highest Physician.—Difference in ecclesiastical usages is not incompatible with unity in the faith.—*Zeisius:* —Constraint and Christian liberty cannot well be combined.

Gerlach:—Marginal note of *Luther:* There are two kinds of suffering,—the one of our own choosing, such as the rules of the monks, just as the priests of Baal cut themselves (1 Kings xviii. 28). The world, the Pharisees, and the followers of John regard such sufferings as a great matter, but God despises it. The other kind of suffering is sent us by the Lord; and willingly to bear this cross, is right and well-pleasing in the sight of God. Hence Christ says that His disciples fast not because the Bridegroom is with them: *i. e.*, since God had not sent them sufferings, and Christ was still with them to protect them, they neither sought nor invented sorrow for themselves, for such were without value before God; but when He was taken from them, they both fasted and suffered.

Heubner:—Compassion and love toward sinners is the sacrifice most acceptable to God—of far greater value than the most pompous worship.—Christianity is opposed to all *slavish* discipline.—The doctrine of Jesus cannot be combined with the old traditions of Pharisaism. This were only miserable patchwork.

VI.

The woman with an issue of blood, and the dead maiden; or, the twofold miracle.—Miraculous working of the Lord in the face of despair and death.

Chapter IX. 18–26.

(*The Gospel for the 24th Sunday after Trinity.*—Parallels: Mark v. 22–43; Luke viii. 41–56.)

18 While he spake these things unto them, behold, there came a certain [there came
in a][1] ruler [of the synagogue], and worshipped him, saying,[2] My daughter is even now
dead [has just now died]: but come and lay thy hand upon her, and she shall live.
19, 20 And Jesus arose, and followed him, and *so did* his disciples. And, behold, a woman,
which [who] was diseased with an issue of blood twelve years, came behind *him*, and
21 touched the hem[3] of his garment: For she said within herself, If I may but touch his
22 garment, I shall be whole. But Jesus turned him about, and when he saw her,[4] he
said, Daughter, be of good comfort [cheer];[5] thy faith hath made thee whole. And
23 the woman was made whole from that hour. And when Jesus came into the ruler's
house, and saw the minstrels [pipers, flute-players, αὐλητάς] and the people [crowd][6]
24 making a noise, He said unto them, Give place: for the maid is not dead, but sleepeth.
25 And they laughed him to scorn [laughed at him]. But when the people [crowd][6] were
26 put forth, he went in, and took her by the hand, and the maid arose. And the fame
hereof [this fame, ἡ φήμη αὕτη] went abroad into all that land.

[1] Ver. 18.—Tischendorf: *εἰσελθών*, according to Codd. C., D., E., M., X., etc. [and Cod. Sinait. Lange, in his G. tral., adopts this reading; so also Alford.]—Lachmann: *εἶς, προσελθών*, according to Cod. B.—Griesbach: *εἶς ἐλθών*. [Engl. V.: *a certain* ruler].—*Recepta: ἐλθών*. [The original copy no doubt read in large letters: ΕΙΣΕΛΘΩΝ, which may mean *εἰσελθών* or *εἰς ἐλθών*, probably the former; for *εἷς* is superfluous here, although it occurs frequently in Matthew both after the noun, v. 41; vi. 27; xii. 11; xviii. 5; xxi. 24, and before it, xxii. 35; xxiii. 15; xxvi. 40, 69; xxvii. 14. The *εἰς* refers to the house of Matthew where this scene, like the former, took place, comp. ver. 10.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 18.—Lachmann retains the recitative *ὅτι* after *λέγων*, which makes the speech more lively.

[3] Ver. 20.—[Dr. Lange inserts here in smaller type: *die Quaste*, i. e., *the tassel, fringe*, with reference to the fringes on the borders of the garments which the Jews were commanded to wear (Numb. xv. 38). Dr. Conant also translates *fringe*.—P. S.]

[4] Ver. 22.—[Literally: *And Jesus, turning* (*στραφείς*, the oldest reading, sustained also by Cod. Sinait., for *ἐπιστραφείς*) *and seeing her, said.*—]

[5] Ver. 22.—[*Be of good cheer*, is the usual rendering of the Greek *θάρσει* in the E. V., comp. Matt. ix. 2; xiv. 27; Mark vi. 50; John xvi. 33; Acts xxiii. 11.—P. S.]

[6] Vers. 23 and 25.—[Lange translates *ὄχλος* in both cases *Haufe, crowd*, which is better than *people*.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 18. **Ruler,** *ἄρχων*.—The president of a synagogue. His name was *Jairus, see* Mark v. 22; Luke viii. 41; *ἀρχισυναγωγός*, רֹאשׁ הַכְּנֶסֶת. Every synagogue had its president, who superintended and directed the services. The ruler of a synagogue was at the same time president of its college of elders.

See Vitringa: *Archisynagog.*, Franek., 1685.—Jairus was president of a synagogue at Capernaum.

The reading εἰσελθών, in ver. 18, is not only best attested, but most suitable. The arrival of the ruler of the synagogue interrupted the conversation of the Lord with the Pharisees and the disciples of John, which took place during or after the meal in the house of the publican. It thus happened, that Jesus could prove to these objectors that He was able and willing to rise from the feast and to sympathize with the deepest suffering, nay, to enter the valley of death itself. This constituted both the fasting of Jesus and His mission to relieve the sick. The description of the conduct of Jairus is exceedingly vivid. His first appeal consists in falling down at the feet of Jesus, which he then explains by a few urgent words of entreaty, leading him at once into the midst of his domestic affliction. Accordingly, the Lord first calmed the excitement of the father by proceeding leisurely. In the circumstances, it was quite in accordance with His purpose that the woman afflicted with an issue of blood should have stopped Him by the way. This delay would serve both to try and to strengthen the faith of Jairus.

My daughter has just now died, ἄρτι [in this moment, opposed to πάλαι] ἐτελεύτησεν.—Meyer supposes that there is a difference between this account and those of Mark and Luke. But the latter has καὶ αὕτη ἀπέθνησκεν, which agrees with Matthew. According to these two accounts, the ἐσχάτως ἔχει of Mark must be explained. Jairus left his daughter dying, and hence might express himself either in this way, *She was* (when I went away) *at the point of death*, or else, *She has just died.* The circumstances of the case account sufficiently for the difference in the narrative. (So Chrysostom, Theophylact, Grotius, Wolf, etc.).

Ver. 20. **An issue of blood.**—It is not necessary to enter into details as to the peculiar malady with which the poor woman was afflicted. "The long continuance of this disease not only endangered her general health, but was a direct cause of divorce, and rendered it necessary for her to avoid every public assembly." Von Ammon. According to the law, it rendered unclean, Lev. xv. 19 sqq.

Came behind Him.—A sign of hopelessness. The rapid movements of the Lord, and the peculiar character of her disease, would lead her to come in this way—ashamed, as it were, and timorous. All the greater appears the faith of this woman: she takes hold of the fringes upon the border of Christ's garment, in the conviction that she would thereby be restored. The Hebrews wore four fringes (*zizith*) on the four borders of their garments, in accordance with the commandment in Num. xv. 38.

Ver. 22. **Jesus turned Himself about.**—The other Evangelists report the event more fully. The Lord asks who had touched Him. The woman then comes forward, makes confession, and is dismissed with a word of comfort. Matthew gives a more brief account, satisfied to state the great fact, that this poor hopeless woman by her faith obtained recovery from the Lord, while He was hastening to the bedside of the daughter of Jairus. In this instance, *her faith* is extolled as the medium of her recovery, though it almost seems to stand in direct contrast to that of the palsied man, whose earnestness and energy overcame every obstacle. We might compare the one to a robber, and the other to a thief; but the difference is only in form,—their faith was the same, both in its strength and decision. Although the woman had obtained recovery by her quiet and retiring faith, yet the Lord constrained her to make public confession, partly to seal her faith and to strengthen her recovery, and partly to present her to the world as healed and clean. In ecclesiastical legend she bears the name of *St. Veronica*, and is said (Euseb. vii. 18, and the *Gospel of Nicodemus*, ed. Thilo, p. 561) to have erected to her Deliverer a brass monument in front of her home at Paneas, by the sources of Jordan. But Dr. Robinson (*New Bibl. Researches in Palestine*) thinks it probable that the statue was erected in honor of some Roman emperor.—Owing to this delay by the way, a message could reach Jairus, that his daughter was now dead.

Ver. 23. **The minstrels.**—The appearance of these minstrels indicated that the preparations for the funeral ceremonies had commenced. (Comp. the corresponding articles in the Encyclops., Winer *sub v. Trauer*, Lightfoot *ad loc.*, etc.)

Ver. 24. **The maid is not dead.**—The idea of a trance (Paulus, Schleiermacher, Olshausen) is entirely opposed to the spirit of the text. The words of Jesus are evidently metaphorical, and intended, on the one hand, to present death under a higher than the common aspect (*see* also the history of Lazarus), and on the other, to prepare for the raising of the maiden. The Lord first requested the hired mourners to leave the room; and then, when they laughed Him to scorn, He expelled them. Evidently those around Jairus shared not his faith,—a circumstance which we infer even from the messages brought him by the way (as recorded in Mark and Luke). All the greater was the faith of Jairus, and especially the miracle of the Lord.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. We notice a gradual progression even in the miracles of raising the dead. The maid upon her death-bed,—the youth on the bier,—the man (Lazarus) in the grave. The same progression may also be traced in the doctrine of the *resurrection:* First, the Lord; then the first resurrection of believers; and in the end the general resurrection, 1 Cor. xv. Similarly, these instances of awakening from the dead may be regarded as an earnest of the coming resurrection. By His eternal power, Christ first recalled from death to this mortal life, and then to eternal life.

2. We behold the glory and majesty of the Lord, in that, on the way to the house of Jairus, He displayed no trace of excitement, but that in calm consciousness He is ready to receive any impression from without. Of this we have clear evidence, when, in the midst of the excited crowd, He perceives that one in the agony of faith has touched the fringe of His garment; and when He stops to comfort and confirm the trembling believer, whom His power and grace had restored.

3. The maid was not in a trance; she was dead. But she had died in the anticipation of help, and awaiting the return of her father. Such is the internal connection between the miraculous interposition of Christ, and her who was its subject. A similar connection appears in all the miracles of Christ, and especially in the raising of Lazarus.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

It is proof of a holy feast, and of holy joy, when

we can immediately leave for the house of mourning. —We learn from Jairus, how parental affection may stimulate and strengthen faith and piety.—The disciples of the Pharisees and of John fast; they object and judge; but they cannot bring help to the weary, nor comfort to the afflicted.—The ruler of the synagogue must go to the house of the publican to find the Lord.—How felt need may drive many persons to the Lord, whom in ordinary circumstances obstacles around would have prevented from coming.—From an uncongenial controversy, the Lord forthwith proceeds to a conflict with death, the king of terrors.—To live in the Spirit, is to be always ready.—How the Lord can convert even interruptions into active duty, and an occasion for dispensing blessings.—Jesus, the Saviour of those also who are beyond human hope.—The Saviour of poor diseased woman.—These miracles prove that Christ was about to awaken the dead.—Jesus notices even *that* faith which is unperceived by men, and only finds utterance in sighs.—He blesses and strengthens retiring faith, so that it breaks forth into open profession.—"Daughter, be of good comfort; thy faith hath made thee whole."—Why Christ ascribes to faith the deliverance which He alone works: 1. Because faith alone can receive the deliverance of Christ; 2. because Christ is present in our faith, and works it; 3. because He would convert the *act of faith* into a *life of faith*.—"The maid is not dead, but sleepeth:" 1. She sleepeth according to her disease in this life; 2. under the eye of her God and Saviour; 3. till the hour when she shall be raised.—Death and sleep: 1. Sleep is a kind of death; 2. death is also a kind of sleep.—*Greatness of the moment when Jesus declared that death was but sleep.*—Opposition between the old mourning for the dead and the new life of the Lord.—Comparison between Jewish and Christian mourning: 1. Wherein they agree; 2. wherein they differ.—What is implied in the mysterious silence which the Lord enjoins before the performance of the miracle?—Jesus delivering from the lowest depths,—1. All who believe on Him, or wait for Him; 2. from the depth of guilt, of misery, of death, and of judgment.—The fame of Christ, as awakening the dead, going forth into all the world: 1. The preparation for Easter; 2. Easter itself: 3. the echo of Easter throughout Christendom; 4. the harbinger of the day of judgment, which shall usher in the eternal Easter.

Starke:—*Zeisius:* Woman, who has brought sin and misery into our world, should be distinguished, both inwardly and outwardly, by great humility, 1 Tim. ii. 14; 1 Pet. iii. 3.—The Lord oftentimes delays long, but He always comes at the right moment, Ps. xxii. 2; Hab. ii. 3.—God sometimes deprives us of all outward means, or renders them insufficient, in order to bring us to Himself.—When our faith has saved us, joy and peace in the Holy Ghost succeed. —2 Cor. v. 4; 1 Tim. vi. 7; 2 Pet. i. 14.—*Zeisius:* Leave the pomp and vanity of the world, if you would see the miracles and the glory of God and of Christ; for, in order to perceive them, you require quietness of soul, Ps. lxii. 2; Isa. xxx. 15.—*Cramer:* Those who scorn the Lord and His benefits, are not deemed worthy to witness His miracles, Isa. xxxiii. 1.—The fame of Christ spreads through the whole land, and it is vain to attempt suppressing the Gospel.

Gossner:—For Christ death is not death, but only a peaceful slumber.

Lisco:—Full of reverence for Jesus and of womanly modesty, and feeling herself unclean in the eye of the law, she seeks, in the fulness of her faith, help *in secret*.—In prayer we also touch the Lord, who, though invisible, is near to us.—Jesus, our Deliverer from sorrow and death.

Heubner:—Those who are in the higher ranks of life (the ruler of the synagogue) should not be ashamed to seek the help of Christianity.—*He worshipped Him.* The deeper our humiliation, the higher the aspirations of the soul.—What consolation does Christianity offer to parents on the loss of beloved children?—Christ still takes us by the hand.—*And Jesus arose.* This teaches His disciples that they should spare no trouble to help men and to save souls.—The woman a picture of modesty and humility.—Press through any obstacle that may intervene between Christ and thee.—Faith renders the weakest means effective.—Those who are most timid and shrinking, are oftentimes most gracious and near to Christ.—The scorn of worldly men need not disturb the faithful servant of God.—With His living hand did He take hold of the dead hand.—How we may rightly touch Jesus.—The certitude of Jesus, and of the believing soul.—Personal and domestic suffering leading us to Jesus.

Bretschneider:—The laughter of unbelief about the hope of immortality.—*Theremin* (in Zimmermann's *Collection*, ii., 1827):—How sorrow and suffering abound on earth, but how the Lord is able to deliver from all suffering.—*Rambach* (*Entwürfe*, 1831):—Weep not for the dead.—*Niemann* (*Sermons*, p. 355):—Believing remembrance of those who have gone before, a rich blessing, as teaching us,—1. To love more purely; 2. to contend more faithfully; 3. to pray more penitently; 4. to die more joyfully.—*Eylert:*—Death under the picture of sleep.—*Reinhard:*—On the calmness with which Christians should act, even when surrounded by an excited multitude.—On the fact, that the conduct of true Christians frequently appears ridiculous to the men of the world.—*Grüneisen:*—The perfectness of the human life of the Redeemer.—*Kraussold:*—The dear cross: 1. It comes from the Lord; 2. it leads to the Lord; 3. it is blessed by the Lord.—*C. Beck:* —The power of faith: 1. Excited by affliction; 2. strong in confidence; 3. blessed in what it receives. —*Bachmann:*—Jesus Christ the true helper in every need.

VII.

The cure of the blind men and of the dumb demoniac; or, the fame and the defamation of the miracles of Jesus. The healing agency of the Lord, the earnest of coming salvation, in view of the hardening and the blasphemy of His enemies.

Chapter IX. 27–34.

27 And when Jesus departed thence, two blind men followed him, crying, and saying,
28 *Thou* Son of David, have mercy on us.[1] And when he was [had] come into the house,
the blind men came to him: and Jesus saith unto them, Believe ye that I am able to
29 do this? They said [say, λέγουσιν] unto him, Yea, Lord. Then touched he their eyes,
30 saying, According to your faith be it unto you. And their eyes were opened; and
31 Jesus straitly charged [threatened][2] them, saying, See *that* no man know *it*.[3] But
they, when they were departed, spread abroad his fame in all that country.
32 As they went out,[4] behold, they brought to him a dumb man possessed with a
33 devil.[5] And when the devil was cast out, the dumb spake: and the multitudes mar-
34 velled, saying, It [he] was never so seen in Israel. But the Pharisees said, He casteth
out devils through the prince of the devils.

[1] Ver. 17.—[The original reverses the order: *Have mercy on us, Son of David.*—]

[2] Ver. 30.—[Ἐνεβριμήσατο. Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Alford (in the 4th ed.) adopt the passive form ἐνεβριμήθη, which is quite unusual, but supported by Codd. ℵ (Sinait.), B., C. Angelo Mai's ed. of the Vatican Cod. (B) reads ἐνεβρειμήθη, but Buttmann's ed.: ἐνεβριμήθη. The verb ἐμβριμᾶσθαι (from the radix βρμ—comp. *fremo* and the German *brummen*—a heavy murmuring sound) signifies in general the utterance of vehement emotion either of wrath and indignation, or (as in John xi. 33) of grief; then threatening admonition, as here. Chrysostom *in loc.*: οὐχ ἁπλῶς κελεύει, ἀλλὰ καὶ μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς σφοδρότητος. Meyer *in loc.* explains the *indignant* threat in this case from the fear of its uselessness, comp. ver. 32. Lange renders the ἐνεβριμήσατο: *bedrohte;* the Vulg.: *comminatus est;* Luther and de Wette: *bedräuete;* van Ess: *befahl ihnen ernstlich;* Wiclif: *thretened;* Tyndale, Cranmer, Geneva: *charged;* Rheims: *threatened;* the C. V.: *straitly*—*i. e.*, strictly, rigorously—*charged;* Conant: *sternly charged.* The authorized version renders the word ἐμβριμᾶσθα (which occurs five times in the N. T.), by three different verbs, viz.: *straitly charged*, Matt. ix. 30; Mark i. 43; *murmured*, Mark xiv. 5; *groaned*, John xi. 33, 38.—P. S.]

[3] Ver. 30.—[Dr. Conant and the N. T. of the Am. Bible Union render ὁρᾶτε μηδεὶς γινωσκέτω: *Take heed, let no one know it.* So ὁρᾶτε should be translated before the imperative, as is done by the Author. E. V. in Matt. xvi. 6.—P. S.]

[4] Ver. 32.—[More correctly: *And as they were going out*, Αὐτῶν δὲ ἐξερχομένων.—P. S.]

[5] Ver. 32.—[Lange: *einen dämonischen Stummen*, or *a dumb demoniac*, *i. e.*, a man who had become dumb in consequence of the possession. The Author. V. makes the false impression that he was dumb before.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

General Remarks.—These two miracles are recorded by Matthew alone. They are here related, partly because they formed the close of a glorious day, and partly because in them the power of Christ appears in a new light. The distinguishing feature in the case of the two blind persons consisted in their invoking Jesus as the Son of David, or the Messiah; so that their supplication almost amounted to a distinct Christian profession. The opposite characteristic marked the case of the dumb demoniac, who was not dumb from any organic defect, but rendered such by the evil spirit of whom he was possessed. He was a demoniac without appearing to be such, since his condition remained concealed under a dumbness which originated either in unconquerable melancholy, or in malicious stubbornness. The dumb person was prevented by the demon from speaking, and the omniscience of the Saviour appeared in His immediately recognizing the source of the evil. The miracle was in so far extraordinary, as its only basis was the faith of those who brought the demoniac to the Lord; while, at the same time, the malice and blasphemy of the Pharisees served to confirm the power of the evil one over his victim. Thus the first of these miracles was, so to speak, enacted on the threshold of the kingdom of heaven; the second, at the gate of hell.

Ver. 27. **Two blind men.**—Blindness is a very common affliction in the East, especially in Egypt, Arabia, and Palestine. It was caused by the strong reflection of light, by lightning, dust, hot days, cold nights, frequent sleeping in the open air, etc. The persons here spoken of were not blind by nature, but by disease. In John ix. the contrary was the case, and is so expressly stated.

Son of David.—The designation of the Messiah. *See* xii. 23; xv. 22; xx. 31; xxi. 9, 15; xxii. 44–45.

Ver. 28. **Into the house**;—*i. e.*, His dwelling at Capernaum. The circumstance, that the blind men followed Him thither, seems itself miraculous. They found their way in the train of Christ, as if some glimmer of light had already been granted. Similarly, the persistence with which they openly ascribed to the Lord a Messianic title which He had not yet publicly assumed, was a signal manifestation of their faith. They were not healed by the way, partly because Jesus would try their faith, and partly because as yet He would not in public reply to the address of *Messiah*.

Ver. 29. [**According to your faith be it done to you.**—An important word, which shows the relation of man's faith to God's grace. Faith is the hand which takes what God offers, the spiritual organ of appropriation, the ὄργανον ληπτικόν, the conducting link between emptiness and God's fulness. "It is the bucket let down into the fountain of God's grace, without which the man could not draw up out of that fountain; the purse, which does not itself make its owner rich, but which yet effectually enriches him by the treasure which it contains."—P. S.]

Ver. 30. **Their eyes were opened,**—*i. e.*, they received their sight. A common Hebrew expression, as in 2 Kings vi. 17; Isa. xxxv. 5, etc.

Straitly [sternly] charged [threatened] them.—Properly, He threatened them, full of indig-

nation, ἐνεβριμήσατο. They had already publicly invoked Him as the Son of David, and He had holpen them. Accordingly, they would be still more prone to proclaim Him as Messiah, which might have led the people of Galilee into rebellion against their temporal rulers, and to a carnal movement, which was quite contrary to the purposes of Jesus. Hence the Lord now threatened them with all earnestness, although without succeeding in imposing silence upon them. In all probability the fame of this miracle spread far beyond Capernaum. Hence the title, *Son of David*, became now generally known, and Jesus felt all the more inclined soon to leave the district.*

Ver. 33. **It [He] was never so seen,** οὐδέποτε ἐφάνη οὕτως.—Meyer: **It**, *i. e.*, the expulsion of demons. Rettig, Fritzsche: **He** has never so appeared or shown Himself. (The common explanation is, that οὕτως stands for τοῦτο or τοιοῦτό τι, against which, *see* Meyer.) If it were necessary to limit the word **it** to that one peculiar kind of expelling demons, we should feel constrained to adopt the explanation proposed by Rettig and Fritzsche. But this does not seem requisite in view of the emphatic meaning attaching to the word ἐφάνη. The Jews would necessarily connect the idea of *appearing* with the appearance of the Messiah. Hence the expression would imply: never before has the appearance (of the promised deliverance) been so fully realized. This also throws light on the expression, **in Israel,** which evidently implies that this had been the brightest Messianic appearance as yet vouchsafed to the theocracy. Perhaps the statement was intentionally couched in indefinite language from fear of the powerful party of Christ's enemies.

Ver. 34. **Through the prince of the devils,** ἐν τῷ ἄρχοντι, κ.τ.λ.—Afterward he is designated more particularly in ch. xii. 24. The particle ἐν indicates intimate connection and fellowship. He is in league with Satan and his power, to which the lower demons are subject. As mention is not made of any reply by the Lord, we conclude that on this occasion the Pharisees had uttered the sentiment behind the Lord, but in the presence of those who acknowledged His power.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. This is the first instance in which the Lord performed a miracle when invoked in His character as the Messiah. The expressions employed in the text are very remarkable. Jesus first asks, "Believe ye that I am able to do this?"—not, that I am the Messiah; and then adds, According to your faith be it unto you! But on this very account He insisted the more earnestly that the secret should be kept. He could not, indeed, prevent that the cure of the blind men should openly appear, nor that they should ascribe it to His power. But He sought to prevent their publishing in what name and character He had performed it. The patent secret of His dignity was now bursting forth with increasing clearness. Hence also the reviling and the blasphemy of His enemies.

2. The healing of the dumb demoniac affords a glimpse into a class of sufferings which are apparently physical and organic, but whose seat is really in the soul. The Spirit of Christ alone was able to light up this darkness, and thus to remove their affliction.

3. The blasphemy of the Pharisees gradually develops: 1. They blaspheme in their own minds; 2. then behind the Lord; 3. at last they venture openly to confront Him with their daring charge.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

How the two blind persons represent to us the work of evangelists. I. They resemble evangelists,—*a.* in that they openly invoke the Lord as Messiah; *b.* in that, in their blindness, they follow in His train to the house; *c.* in that they have faith and constancy, are tried and approved; *d.* in that they obtain help on making confession of faith. II. They differ from evangelists in wanting full obedience; and although their joy may plead their excuse, yet their spiritual sight was evidently still weak, though their bodily sight had been restored them.—Christ appearing as the Master in the carefulness of His dealings with sinners.—The light of the eye: I. a natural gift of God; II. a miraculous gift of the Lord; III. a symbol of the spiritual gift of God.—*They brought to Him.* Persons in such a state of depression must be brought to the Lord by their believing friends.—How the Master immediately descries the secret evil under which the demoniac labored.—If there be but a spark of faith, the Lord can remove the most desperate case of spiritual bondage.—Let us never lose sight even of those who suffer under melancholy and obstinate self-seclusion.—The highest achievements of faith always evoke the greatest revilings of unbelief.—It is a mark of the spirit of Satan to decry what the Lord achieves as the work of Satan.—There is always some patent self-contradiction about blasphemies.—The triumphs of the Lord in view of His enemies: the first manifestation of heaven and hell upon earth.—Christ lifting the veil of revelation in a twofold manner: by healing the blind in His character as Messiah; and the dumb, by unmasking and overcoming the demon who caused his disease.—At the threshold of Christ's abode, precipitate evangelists and dumb demoniacs may meet.—Christ between precipitate professors and the obstinately dumb. 1. He bids the former be silent, and the latter speak; 2. He is obeyed by the latter, rather than by the former.—Christ healing us by removing our morbid sensations; more especially, *a.* excitement, in its imaginary heights; *b.* depression, in its dark depths.—The miracles of grace extend from the gates of heaven to those of hell.—Demoniac sins which we consciously commit, such as blasphemy, are infinitely more dangerous than demoniac sufferings, when we are depriv-

* Vers. 30 and 31.—[ALFORD remarks on ἐνεβριμήσατο, or ἐνεβριμήθη as he reads with Lachmann: "The purpose of our Lord's earnestness appears to have been twofold: (1) that He might not be so occupied and overpressed with applications as to have neither time nor strength for the preaching of the Gospel; (2) to prevent the already excited people from taking some public measure of recognition, and arousing the malice of the Pharisees before His hour was come.—No doubt the two men were guilty of an act of disobedience in thus breaking the Lord's solemn injunction: for obedience is better than sacrifice; the humble observance of the word of the Lord, than the most laborious and wide-spread will-worship after man's own mind and invention." TRENCH (Notes on Miracles of our Lord, Lond., 6th ed., p. 198) considers it characteristic that all the Romish interpreters excuse or rather applaud these men for not strictly adhering to Christ's command; while the Reformed, whose first principle is to take God's Word as absolute rule and law and to place obedience above sacrifice, consider this publishing of the miracle against the express admonition a blemish in the faith of these men. I add the brief but excellent note of Wordsworth on ver. 31: "Glory is not to be obtained by seeking for it, but by declining it." *Sequentem fugit, fugientem sequitur gloria.*—P. S.]

ed of liberty.—Christ first removes the storm at sea, and, last of all, the dark intricacies of settled melancholy.

Starke:—Faith of the heart and confession of the mouth always go hand in hand, Rom. x. 9, 10.—True faith is not deterred by delays.—According to thy faith shall it be unto thee.—Envy and reviling are not far removed from each other, 2 Cor. xii. 20.

Gerlach:—Christ Himself teaches us (John ix. 39) to regard the healing of the blind as an emblem of inward illumination, or of the conversion of the heart.

Heubner:—One deliverance after another.—One work of love leads to another.—Believe ye?—a question always addressed by the Lord to us when we seek help.—The deaf and dumb, the picture of a sinner whom the evil spirit within suffers not to confess his misery, or to pray.—Should we be moved by the judgment of schools, or parties, in opposition to true religion, when Jesus Himself experienced such contradiction from the learned?

VIII.

Triumph of Christ over the reviling of the Pharisees. Royal preparation for the mission of the Apostles. The power of Christ unfolding in all its fulness, as also the misery of the people. The one Helper about to manifest Himself by many helpers.

Chapter IX. 35–38.

35 And Jesus went about all the cities and villages, teaching in their synagogues, and
preaching the gospel [good news] of the kingdom, and healing every sickness and eve-
36 ry disease [weakness, infirmity, μαλακίαν] among the people.[1] But when he saw the
multitudes, he was moved with compassion on them, because they fainted [were ha-
37 rassed[2]], and were scattered abroad [abandoned], as sheep having no shepherd. Then
saith he unto [to] his disciples, The harvest truly [indeed] *is* plenteous [great, πολύς],[3]
38 but the labourers *are* few; Pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest, that he will send
forth labourers into his harvest.

[1] Ver. 35.—[The words of the *text. rec.*: *among the people*, ἐν τῷ λαῷ, are retained by Lange, but omitted in all modern critical editions, German and English (including Wordsworth), and were probably inserted from ch. iv. 23.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 36.—[Dr. Lange translates: *zerschlagen*, as he adopts the reading ἐσκυλμένοι, *jaded*, *harassed* (from σκύλλω, *to strip*, *to lacerate*, then metaph. *to trouble*, *to vex*; hence the *Vulgata*: *vexati*), which is supported by the best MSS., ℵ., B., C., D., etc., the ancient versions, and the critical editors, Griesb., Lachm., Tischend., Meyer, Alford, Wordsworth. The reading of the Received Text: ἐκλελυμένοι (from ἐκλύω, *to loosen*, *debilitate*, ἐκλύομαι, *to faint*, *to be exhausted*) has no weighty critical authority in its favor.—P. S.]

[3] Ver. 37.—[Lange after Luther: *Die Ernte ist gross*, *i. e.*, *great*, which is more correct than *plenteous*, since πολύς refers to the *extent* of the harvest field and the labor to be performed which far exceeds the capacity of the small number of laborers. Comp. Conant *ad loc.*—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The general narrative given in the text serves as introduction to the following section, which describes the mission of the Apostles. At the same time, it also forms the conclusion of the preceding narrative. As the Lord unfolds His power, the misery and need of the people increasingly appear; He stretches forth His arms and raises up the Twelve Apostles, to carry on the work, and to spread its blessings. Thus His prophetic merges in His royal work.

Ver. 35. **And Jesus went about.**—From the parallel passages we gather that Jesus now travelled along the lake, through the cities and villages of Galilee. It is but natural that the popular misery should then unfold to His view in all its fulness. Accordingly, we distinguish three missionary journeys of Jesus in Galilee. 1. To the Mount of Beatitudes; 2. across the sea; 3. through the valley, along the shore, in the direction of Jerusalem. It is to the latter that the text refers.

Ver. 36. **They were** ἐσκυλμένοι.—Explanations: 1. The common reading, ἐκλελυμένοι, *faint*, *tired*. So some. *a.* With reference to the people, who had travelled a considerable distance and were faint (Fritzsche). *b.* In a figurative sense, a flock without a shepherd, and hence tired by going astray (Kuinoel).—2. According to the meaning of σκύλλειν, *to tear*, *to plague*. *a.* Bretschneider: torn by wolves. *b.* De Wette: plagued by hunger, by cold, by ravening beasts, etc. *c.* Meyer and the Vulgate: *vexati*. But the first point to be ascertained is, whether the term refers to the *difficulties* of a flock without a shepherd, or to *positive sufferings* which it had to undergo. As the latter is evidently conveyed by the verb, we explain it as meaning *afflicted*, *beaten down*, and *scattered* by thorns, by anxiety, by ravenous beasts, and plagues of every sort.—Ἐῤῥιμμένοι (ῥίπτειν, to *cast down*, to *stretch down*), not *scattered* (Beza, Luther, Authorized Version), but *cast down*, *beaten down* by flight or by weariness (Kypke, de Wette); or *stretched down* as sheep that are worn out (Meyer).

Ver. 37. **The harvest is great** (occurs in Luke x. 2, at the sending forth of the seventy);—*i. e.*, the number of people who are accessible to the Gospel, and ready to receive it, is great.—**The laborers are few.**—As yet, Jesus was the only laborer. Their prayers were intended to prepare them for their mission.

Ver. 38. **The Lord of the harvest, that He will send forth laborers.**—His work is the work of God: ἐκβάλῃ, the urgent necessity existing, should determine the Lord of the harvest to drive forth, or to thrust forth, laborers.* De Wette calls attention to the circumstance, that it is God who is asked to send laborers. He is so far right, as the call of Christ ultimately proceeds from God, just as the kingdom of the Saviour is that of God.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The deep need of the world determined the Lord to manifest His royal dignity. Neither the priesthood nor the kingdoms of the ancient world were capable of bringing any real help to men. Even chosen Israel, with its high priests, sanhedrim, rulers, and rabbins, were but a scattered, broken-down, hopeless, and helpless flock. Under these circumstances it was that Christ manifested Himself as the Shepherd of His people, which implied that He was the Shepherd of all nations.† The deep moral misery of the people appeared most clearly in the rich and fertile district of Galilee, with its numerous and prosperous cities.

2. In the same moment, when Christ was about to manifest Himself as King, and in His compassion to condescend to the boundless misery of His people, He prepared to found the apostolic office, which He graciously endowed with His gifts and His Spirit, for the salvation of the world.

3. In the life and actings of Jesus, we always find these two elements combined: provision for what is future and distant, with provision for what is present and immediate—a due regard for what was general, and care for that which was special and urgent.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Jesus went about doing good to all (Acts x. 38): 1. The extent of His labors (*about all the cities and villages*); 2. the order of His labors (*teaching in their synagogues*); 3. the characteristic feature of His labors (*preaching the gospel of the kingdom*); 4. the seal of His labors (*healing every sickness*, etc.).—While the Lord passed through rich cities and villages, His attention was mainly directed to the need and the sufferings of the people.—How wants seem to grow in proportion as the Lord gives help: 1. This help brings them to light; 2. it inspires with courage to make them known.—*But when He saw the multitudes, He was moved with compassion on them.*—Christ looking on the scattered flock of man: 1. A look of penetration; 2. a look of sorrow; 3. a look of saving mercy.—The impression which the people made on the Lord: 1. Not admiration, but pity; 2. not aversion, but pity; 3. not discouragement, but pity.—The Church under the hierarchical shepherds of older and more modern times: 1. Without a shepherd, and therefore without protection, and broken down; 2. without a shepherd, and therefore not led to the green pastures, and cast down.—Christ born to be the Shepherd of men, and in His compassion the Shepherd of His people.—Christ born to be the King of men, by His compassion the King of His people.—What induced Christ to manifest Himself as King instead of Prophet.—The compassion of Christ enlisting heaven and earth for our succor: 1. The grace of the Father; 2. the prayer of His people; 3. the service of His messengers.—*The harvest is great, but the laborers are few.*—How those who judge according to the letter reverse this saying; but those who judge according to the spirit feel its deep import.—The great need of man, the great harvest of God.—*The prayer to God for laborers* forming the commencement of the kingdom of heaven: 1. The commencement of the apostolate; 2. the commencement of the Church; 3. the commencement of missionary labors; 4. the commencement of the final completion of the Church of God.—*The right laborers:* 1. They are sent by God; 2. in answer to the prayers of His people; 3. furnished by Christ for the work; 4. consecrated for the spiritual and temporal wants of the people; 5. instruments of mercy in the hands of Christ.—Our Father in heaven, *the Lord of the harvest:* 1. The seed is His; 2. the field is His; 3. the harvest is His.—How Christ is employed about the harvest of God. He takes charge, 1. of the seed, as being the Word from the beginning; 2. of the field, as being the great Laborer and Servant of the Lord; 3. of the harvest, as being the Son and the Judge of the world.—How Christ summons His own to coöperate with Him, in order to spread through them His blessings over the earth.*—The great King, in whom the grace of God itself has appeared to His people.

Rieger:—The Lord always looked upon the common people with pity, treated them with indulgence, and traced the cause of their misery to their leaders, who exclude others from the kingdom of heaven.

Starke:—Good shepherds are one of the most precious gifts of God, even as bad pastors are the greatest misfortune and plague of the world.—*Quesnel:*—The whole earth is the field where the harvest of the Lord is to be gathered.—Many labor in the name of the Lord; but few will He own as His servants.—*Osiander:*—Ministers are fellow-workers with God, 1 Cor. iii. 9; 2 Cor. vi. 1.—Successful laborers are obtained in answer to prayer.—*Cramer:*—This prayer enters into the three first petitions in the Lord's Prayer.—The prayer of the pious members of the congregation is mightier than the protection of the state.

Heubner:—What an accusation against the scribes and priests!—Oh, if people would only pray as they ought for pastors!—That He send them (ἐκβάλῃ) by the mighty impulse of His Spirit.

* [The verb ἐκβάλλειν, *to expel, to cast out*, like the Hebrew שָׁלַח and גָּרַשׁ, signifies sometimes *to send forth;* comp. Matt. xiii. 52 (E. V.: *bringeth forth* out of his treasure); Mark i. 12 (*driveth* him into the wilderness); ver. 43 (*sent him away*); Luke x. 2, 35; John x. 4 (he *putteth forth* his own sheep), comp. Matt. x. 34, βαλεῖν εἰρήνην, 'I am come *to send* peace on earth.' But perhaps there is some reference here to the urgent necessity of laborers, as Dr. Lange explains above, or to the Divine impulse, as Dr. Wordsworth suggests, which constrains men unwilling and unable of themselves to labor in so great a work, and makes them feel and say: 'Woe to me if I do not preach the Gospel' (1 Cor. ix. 16).—P. S.]

† [Dr. WHEDON on ver. 38: "No doubt our Lord primarily has in view the Jewish multitudes before Him. Yet in more distant prospect is to be included the wide field of the *world* and its vast harvest in the coming age."—]

* [Dr. WHEDON: "*Pray ye therefore.*—Divine operation waits upon human coöperation. God will do, in answer to prayer, what will not be done without prayer. Low faith in the Church produces slow development of the work of salvation."—P. S.]

SECOND SECTION.

CHRIST MANIFESTING HIMSELF AS KING.—A. AS SHEPHERD OF HIS PEOPLE, IN SENDING TO THE SCATTERED SHEEP HIS TWELVE APOSTLES, ENDOWED WITH THE POWER OF HIS SPIRIT, FOR THE PURPOSE OF ESTABLISHING THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN.

Chapter X. (Mark iii. 13–19; vi. 7–11; Luke ix. 1–5, etc.).

Contents:—The first evangelistic journey of the Lord had led through the mountains of Galilee; the second, across the sea to the country of the Gadarenes. On His third journey, the Lord visits the populous cities and villages of Lower Galilee, along the coast of the lake and in the direction of Samaria and Jerusalem. In measure as help is extended by the Lord, both the need and the desire for help seem to increase. Accordingly, the Lord is obliged to send forth, in the power of His Spirit, His Apostles, in order, through them, to give succor to the multitudes around. Hence, the first mission of the disciples, the calling of the Apostles, and the instructions, which, although primarily given to them and for that special occasion, are applicable to all times. The chapter describes, 1. The separation, calling, and setting apart of the twelve. 2. The commission given them, corresponding to their equipment for the work; or, the mission of the Apostles, and their means of subsistence. 3. Their special direction to those who were prepared to receive the word, particularly to pious households, with injunctions about remaining and going away. 4. Prediction of the hostile reception which the Gospel would meet in the world, and of the persecutions which would await the Apostles. 5. Their duty under persecution: *a*. Freedom from anxiety as to what they should answer; *b*. constancy to the end, amid the dreadful contests between believers and unbelievers; *c*. holy flight; *d*. encouragement from the similar treatment received by the Master; *e*. fearlessness, openness, and readiness to meet death, in view of the one thing to be feared; *f*. trustfulness in the preserving care of the Father. 6. The reward of faithful witnesses and confessors of the Lord, and the punishment of those who denied Him. 7. The Gospel as declaration of war to the world, or, the holy sword. 8. Supreme love to the Lord as decisive in this warfare: *a*. The opponents, and their judgment; *b*. the friends and allies, and their reward.

---

1. *Choice of the Apostles.* Ch. X. 1–4.

1 And when he had called unto *him* his twelve disciples, he gave them power *against*
[over][1] unclean spirits, to cast them out, and to heal all manner of sickness, and all
2 manner of disease [weakness, infirmity]. Now the names of the twelve Apostles are
these; The first,[2] Simon, who is called Peter, and Andrew his brother; James *the son*
3 of Zebedee, and John his brother; Philip, and Bartholomew; Thomas, and Matthew
the publican; James *the son* of Alpheus, and Lebbeus, whose surname was Thaddeus;[3]
4 Simon the Cananite,[4] and Judas Iscariot, who also betrayed [delivered] him.

[1] Ver. 1.—[*Over* (as in Conant's Matthew and the N. T. of the Am. Bible Union) is expressed by the construction of ἐξουσίαν with the genitive, and need not be italicized as *against* in the E. V.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 2.—[Πρῶτος is rendered by Conant and the N. T. of the Am. Bible Union: *first*, viz. in the order of enumeration (nomen *numerale*), while the translation *the first* (nomen *dignitatis*) implies a certain superiority of rank or primacy of honor (but no supremacy of jurisdiction), in other words, makes Peter *primus inter pares* (not *summus supra inferiores*). The C. V. is right here, since the other Apostles are not numbered, as we should expect, if πρῶτος referred merely to the arrangement, or the priority of calling (which rather belongs to Andrew and John, and not to Peter, comp. John i. 37–41). Maldonatus: "*Si numerale nomen esset, cætera quoque numeralia nomina, quæ post illud sequuntur posita essent.*" Most modern Protestant commentators admit a certain primacy of Peter, who stands first in *all* the lists of the apostles, as James, John, and Andrew follow *next*, and Judas stands *last*, but they deny the inferences of the Roman Cath. Church, based upon doctrinal and historical assumptions which can never be proven. *See* Com.—P. S.]

[3] Ver. 3.—[The oldest authorities read only either *Lebbeus* or *Thaddeus;* the *textus receptus* unites both with the addition *surnamed*, ὁ ἐπικληθείς. Lange reads simply *Lebbeus* with Tischendorf and Meyer (also Alford in the 4th ed.), and puts the words: *surnamed Thaddeus* in brackets; while Lachmann, Tregelles, and Conant give the preference to *Thaddeus* after the Vatican Cod., etc.—P. S.]

[4] Ver. 4.—The reading Καναναῖος (for Κανανίτης) is supported by Codd. B., C., D. [The word should be rendered *Cananite* as the revised edition of the Am. Bible Society (1854), the revised version of Dr. Conant and the Am. Bible Union have it, and as Dr. Crosby (*The N. T. with Explan. Notes or Scholia*) proposes, instead of *Canaanite* as in the usual editions of the E. V., including those of the Am. B. Soc. since 1855.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1. **And having called to Him His twelve disciples,** προσκαλεσάμενος, etc.—Luke relates that, having spent the preceding night in prayer, the Lord called the twelve *together*, and then furnished and fitted them for their mission. Meyer says: "The mission, not the choice, of the twelve is here recorded." But we must distinguish three calls: the first, to be disciples; the second, to serve as evangelists; and now the third, to the apostolic office. This call to the apostolate, however, was only preliminary, and limited by the present cir

cumstances and position of the Church. The apostolic office obtained its full proportions after the ascension of our Lord, when the knowledge of the disciples and their testimony was completed, and the Holy Spirit poured out on the day of Pentecost.

The call of *twelve Apostles*, indicating a definite and fixed number, shows that in its ultimate idea the apostolate was *one*, and that each individual called and sent by the Lord possessed the power and authority of the whole college of Apostles.

His twelve disciples.—They were called together as His twelve chosen disciples; but, after receiving authority, they became His twelve Apostles. A proof this, that a decisive change had taken place in their condition, although they did not cease to be His disciples in the strictest sense of the term.

Twelve.—Theophylact: κατὰ τὸν ἀριθμὸν τῶν δώδεκα φυλῶν. Matt. xix. 28. They are, primarily, ambassadors to the twelve tribes of Israel, and to this their number corresponds. The twelve tribes bore typical reference to the purpose which Israel was intended to serve in the world. On the one hand, they expressed the idea of a full number, or of the fulness of the Spirit; while, on the other, they represented the world, which, in all its forms, was to be pervaded by this fulness of the Spirit. What the twelve tribes of Israel were typically, the twelve Apostles were in deed and in truth, being the twelve representatives and vehicles of the spiritual fulness with which Christ pervades His people, and, through them, the world.*

He gave them ἐξουσίαν, **power,** rule, authority; or, here, the power of conquerors.—De Wette and Ewald think that this power was conveyed in a mystical and symbolic form; Meyer, by a mere declaration. No special form is, indeed, mentioned in the text; but, as symbolical signs accompanied the outpouring of the Spirit at Pentecost, and as, even before that, we read of the Saviour breathing on them (John xx. 22) as the symbol of their consecration, we are warranted in inferring that, when first sent on their apostolic mission, the bestowal of power was accompanied by some outward sign. Perhaps the solemn authority given them in the words, "Heal the sick," etc., may have been that sign. For, as the Lord performed His miraculous cures chiefly by the word of His power, so this word may also have conveyed similar authority to others. On the Mount of Olives there was the symbol of the hand lifted in blessing, which pointed to the pentecostal effusion.

Ver. 2. **The names of the twelve Apostles.**—These now assume greater importance. Four lists of the Apostles are extant: that in the text; that in Mark iii. 16; that in Luke vi. 14; and that in Acts i. 13.* The enumeration in the Gospel according to Luke is made almost in the same order as in Matthew, although it occurs at an earlier stage, and in connection with the Sermon on the Mount. In Luke, the name of Thomas occurs after that of Matthew; that of James Alpheus along with that of Simon, instead of Judas Lebbeus, so that the latter is conjoined with Judas Iscariot. Probably this arrangement was adopted as more easy for the memory, while that of Matthew was the more authentic. Again, the enumeration in the Gospel of Mark agrees with that in the Book of Acts, which was determined by the later positions occupied by the Apostles. Thus we distinguish two lists of Apostles,—the first, as determined by their earliest mission; the second, according to the relative position of the Apostles at the feast of Pentecost and afterward. Bengel: *Universi ordines habent tres quaterniones, quorum nullus cum alio quicquam permutat; tum in primo semper primus est Petrus, in secundo Philippus, in tertio Jacobus Alphæi; in singulis cæteri apostoli loca permutant; proditor semper extremus.*

Ἀπόστολος (ἀποστέλλω), שָׁלִיחַ, occurs also in a wider sense, as in John xii. 16; Phil. ii. 25. In the special sense of the term, it applies to the am-

* [Comp. MALDONATUS, the distinguished Rom. Cath. commentator in *Quatuor Evangelia*, ad loc.: "*Hac ergo de causa* DUODECIM *Christus apostolos esse voluit, ut duodecim Patriarcharum figuram impleret; et quemadmodum ex duodecim Patriarchis totus Judaicus populus carnaliter propagatus est; ita totus populus Christianorum spiritualiter ex duodecim Apostolis propagaretur; venerat enim Christus, ut carnem in spiritum commutaret.*" WORDSWORTH remarks on Matt. x. 2: "The number *Twelve* (3 × 4) in Scripture seems to be significant of perfection and universality; and the twelve apostles were regarded by the ancient church as typified by the twelve Sons of Israel (comp. Matt. xix. 28 and Maldonatus here), the twelve wells at Elim (Ex. xv. 27), and perhaps by the twelve stones of the Urim and Thummim on the breastplate of the High Priest, the type of Christ (Ex. xxviii. 15–21); the twelve loaves of shew-bread; the twelve 'exploratores' of the promised land, the type of heaven; the twelve stones taken from the bed of Jordan. They seem also to be represented by the twelve stars in the crown of the woman in the wilderness, the Church on earth (Rev. xii. 1), as well as by the twelve foundations of the Church glorified (Rev. xxi. 14; Eph. ii. 20)."—P. S.]

* [I subjoin the following synoptic table which exhibits the agreement and the difference, and the fact that all the four catalogues arrange the names into three classes, of which each class includes the same names and is headed by the same name, viz. the first by Peter, the second by Philip, the third by James the son of Alpheus.—P. S.]

	Matthew x. 2–4.	Mark iii. 16–19.	Luke vi. 14–16.	Acts i. 13.
1	Σίμων Πέτρος			
2	Ἀνδρέας	Ἰάκωβος	Ἀνδρέας	Ἰάκωβος
3	Ἰάκωβος	Ἰωάννης	Ἰάκωβος	Ἰωάννης
4	Ἰωάννης	Ἀνδρέας	Ἰωάννης	Ἀνδρέας
5	Φίλιππος			
6	Βαρθολομαῖος	Βαρθολομαῖος	Βαρθολομαῖος	Θωμᾶς
7	Θωμᾶς	Ματθαῖος	Ματθαῖος	Βαρθολομαῖος
8	Ματθαῖος	Θωμᾶς	Θωμᾶς	Ματθαῖος
9	Ἰάκωβος ὁ τοῦ Ἀλφαίου			
10	Λεββαῖος	Θαδδαῖος	Σίμων ὁ καλ. Ζηλωτής	Σίμων ὁ Ζηλωτής
11	Σίμων ὁ Καναναῖος	Σίμων	Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου	Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου
12	Ἰούδας Ἰσκαριώτης	Ἰούδας Ἰσκαριώθ.		Vacant.

bassadors called by God, or the witnesses and representatives of Christ in extending His Church, and with certain limitations, in ruling His Church (Rev. ii. 1, ἄγγελος). The peculiar conditions necessary for the apostolate are mentioned in Acts i. 8, and ver. 21. In a secondary sense, the term is also applied to apostolic messengers, as Rom. xvi. 7; 2 Cor. viii. 32. (Comp. Schaff's *Hist. of the Apost. Church*, § 129, p. 512 sqq.)

Πρῶτος Σίμων.—As the other Apostles are not numbered, it follows that πρῶτος is not accidental (Fritzsche), but indicates a priority. This distinction depended: 1. On the prophetic arrangement of the Lord in this place; 2. on the confession of Peter preceding that of the others, Matt. xvi. 16; 3. on the appearance of Peter at the day of Pentecost, when he was the instrument of founding the Church, Acts ii. 4; 4. on the fact that Peter was the first to carry the gospel to the Gentiles, Acts x. But that this priority of dignity and mission did not imply a primacy of rank—not even so far as his own person was concerned, much less as a permanent arrangement—appears from many declarations of the Lord (Matt. xviii. 18; xx. 25; xxiii. 8; xxviii. 19; John xx. 21; Acts i. 8), from the conduct of Peter himself (Acts xi. 4; xv.; *see* 1 Pet.), and from that of the other Apostles and of the Church (Acts xi.; Gal. ii.).* Meyer suggests that Peter was also first called; but Andrew and John had been summoned before him. The traitor is mentioned last, not merely on account of his end, but also because he was last called. The arrangement into pairs is explained by the notice of Mark, that they were sent forth by two and two.

Vers. 2-4. The *names*.—1. שִׁמְעוֹן Συμεών, Σιμεών, Σίμων (*hearing, answer*, Gen. xxix. 33).—Πέτρος, *stone, rock*, πέτρα,—in Chald. כֵּיפָא, Κηφᾶς. The following is the explanation given in Matt. xvi. 17: *Simon, thou son of Jonas*, of the dove (יוֹנָה), which lodgeth in the clefts of the rock (image of the Church, Song ii. 14; Jer. xlviii. 28), *thou shalt be called the Rock* (of the dove).—2. Ἀνδρέας. Winer regards it as of Greek origin; Olshausen derives it from the Hebrew נָדַר, to make a vow. There seems, however, to have been a peculiar connection between the Grecians and Andrew and Philip, which also appears in their names (John xii. 22). The name Andrew is related to ἀνδρεῖος, *manly*, and to ἀνδριάς, the representation of a man—a *statue*. Probably this Apostle had also a Hebrew name; in which case the name Andrew was given to characterize his manly spirit.—3. Ἰάκωβος, יַעֲקֹב; primarily, an Old Testament name of honor, the original meaning of the name not being taken into account. This James, or the Elder, is designated as ὁ τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου (*see* ch. iv.).—4. Ἰωάννης, יוֹחָנָן, *given by Jehovah*, or by the grace of Jehovah. By the grace of God.† Properly, *God is favorable*, gracious, He grants as of grace.—According to Mark, the sons of Zebedee were called "*sons of thunder;*" not by way of reproof, but as characteristic of their disposition. Probably the name applied primarily to James. John was afterward designated the "friend of Jesus," and "the disciple whom the Lord loved;" in the ancient Church, ὁ ἐπιστήθιος, *i. e.*, he who leaned on His breast [His bosom-friend], sat at His right hand.—5. Φίλιππος. The original derivation of the word is not of personal importance in this case. Probably he had another name. He was a native of Bethsaida, and one of the earliest disciples of Jesus, John i. 43.—6. Βαρθολομαῖος, the same as *Nathanael*. In John i. 46, he occurs in connection with Philip; while in the other Gospels the same event is coupled with Nathanael. נְתַנְאֵל, *the gift of God;* while Bartholomew, בַּר תַּלְמַי, means *son of Tholmai*, Sept. 2 Sam. xiii. 37. תַּלְמַי, properly *rich in furrows, cultivated field*. Perhaps the original designation, "son of Tholmai," was afterward converted into an apostolical by-name, implying, son of a rich field, rich fruit.—7. Θωμᾶς, תְּאוֹם, *gemellus, twin-brother;* Δίδυμος, John xi. 16; xx. 24; xxi. 2.—8. Ματθαῖος ὁ τελώνης: on this name compare the Introduction. His original name was *Levi, the son of Alpheus*.—9. Ἰάκωβος ὁ τοῦ Ἀλφαίου, *James the Younger*, or *the son of Alpheus* (though undoubtedly of other parentage than Matthew).—10. Λεββαῖος, לִבַּי (not from the little town of Libba, near Carmel, as Gerlach and Lisco suggest, but) from לֵב, heart, and meaning almost the same as Θαδδαῖος, תַּדַּי (which occurs in the Talmud), from תַּד, *the breast*,—hence *the hearty* or *courageous*. In later Codd., and in the parallel passages, in Luke vi. 16; Acts i. 13, he is called Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου, *i. e., brother of James*, יְהוּדָה (verbale fut. Hophal a יָדָה, Hiphil, *professus est, celebravit*).—11. Σίμων ὁ Καναναῖος. The latter designation derived from קָנָא, in Chald. קַנְאָן. The explanation of it appears even from the other reading, Κανανίτης, and still more from the title Ζηλωτής in Luke,—the brother of James of Alpheus and of Judas.* On "the brothers of the Lord," *see* the Encycls., and my article *Jacobus* in Herzog's *Reallex*.—12. Ἰούδας ὁ Ἰσκαριώτης, אִישׁ קְרִיּוֹת. From *Kerioth* in the tribe of Judah, Josh. xv. 25. *See* also Lightfoot. Ὁ καὶ (*qui idem*) παραδοὺς αὐτόν, "*Who also delivered Him*" (not "betrayed," which would have been expressed by προδούς). So Meyer. In point of fact, the two, however, are identical.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. From the occurrence of so many double names† of the Apostles, we are naturally led to infer that each had his peculiar designation. But Judas the traitor had none: in the deepest sense he re-

* [Compare the notes of Maldonatus, Olshausen, Meyer, Alford, Barnes, Wordsworth, Alexander, etc., *in loc.*, and my discussion of the question of Peter's alleged primacy and supremacy in the *History of the Apostolic Church*, § 90 (Engl. transl., p. 350 sqq.).—P. S.]

† [Compare the Greek *Theodor*, the German *Gotthold*, *Gottlieb*.—P. S.]

* *Zealots*, for the rational religion, after the example of Phinehas, Num. xxv. 7. They were quite in accordance with the spirit of the theocracy, and acted as reprovers of open and public sin. From the history of the last Jewish war we learn how fearfully this institution had degenerated.

† [Not *bynames*, as the Edinb. translator has it, misled by the German *Beiname*, which means literally *surname*, *cognomen*, while *Nickname* or *Spitzname* is the English *byname* or *nickname*. We must, however, observe a slight difference. The text uses the word *Beiname*, *surname*, for all the additional names of the Apostles, whether old or new (as Peter); but with the ancient Romans *cognomen* was the third name indicating the house (*familia*) of the person (the family name, surname, in German: *Familienname*), while *nomen* described the class (*gens*), and *prænomen* (like our *Christian* name) the individual.—P. S.]

mained anonymous—the man of Kerioth. These additional names serve in many respects to indicate the characteristics of the Apostles. (Comp. *Leben Jesu*, ii. 2, p. 691.)

2. The selection of the twelve Apostles, no doubt, depended on their exhibiting in the highest degree the most precious manifestations of the life of Christ. In some respects their qualifications must have been similar. They were to be *laymen*, unconnected with the priesthood; *unlearned men*, unconnected with traditional philosophy; and *plain men*, unconnected with the false culture and the pomp of the world. Again, so far as their positive qualifications were concerned, they must be *pious Israelites*, *believers in the Messiah*, *disciples*, *men of gifts*, and that of so diverse a character as to form a kind of contrast, and yet to display their higher unity in Christ. In this respect they were to be the antitype of the tribes of Israel (of the twelve gems in the breastplate of the high priest; *see* Rev. xxi. 19, 20, compared with Ex. xxviii. 17), and to exhibit the great features of the Church, as adapted to the various forms of spiritual receptiveness and felt need in the world. The number *twelve* was that of the fulness of the kingdom of God (so to speak, of the ideal presbytery),—*three*, the number of the Spirit, multiplied by *four*, the number of the world. Hence *twelve* was the symbolical number of the world as transformed.

Viewed in this light, we have the following fundamental types:—

1. PETER, the Rock. *Confession.*

2. ANDREW, the manly pioneer. *Missions.*

3. JAMES, the son of thunder. *Martyrdom.*

4. JOHN, the beloved disciple. *Mysticism and ideal depth and calmness.*

5. PHILIP. Moral evidence of faith. *Communion* ("Come and see").

6. BARTHOLOMEW. *Perfect sincerity, simplicity, and devoutness.*

7. THOMAS, the twin. The spirit of inquiry and sacred criticism.

8. MATTHEW. *Theocratic and ecclesiastical learning.*

9. JAMES, the brother of the Lord. [?] *Gift of union, ecclesiastical government.*

10. JUDAS LEBBEUS, THADDEUS. Earnestness for the purity of the Church. *Pastoral faithfulness, discipline.*

11. SIMON, the Zealot. Zeal for a proper development in the Church. *Pastoral activity.*

12. JUDAS ISCARIOT. Secular administration of the Church. *Church property.**

The calling of Judas Iscariot, who is designated a devil, John vi. 70; a thief, xii. 6; the son of perdition, xvii. 12, forms a great theological problem. Either of the two ordinary explanations—that Christ had not known him from the beginning; or else, that He had chosen him to become the voluntary instrument of judgment, and the involuntary instrument of salvation—appears to us opposed to the spirit of Christ. We would rather venture to suggest, that, carried away by temporary enthusiasm, Judas had offered himself to the Lord; that the disciples, blinded by his glowing zeal, had earnestly recommended him to the Master; and that, in the fulness and boldness of His love, Christ had consented to receive a man so richly gifted by nature, chiefly because His refusal might have proved a stumbling-block to the disciples. [?]

[The biblical symbolism of numbers to which Dr. Lange here alludes, is worthy of more serious attention than it has received in English theology. There is room here for fanciful theories; but the main points hardly admit of serious doubt. The careful student of the Scripture must be struck with the frequency of the use of certain numbers, especially 3, 4, 7, 10, and 12, in significant connection with sacred ideas and things, from Genesis to Revelation. It is impossible to resolve all this into mere accident, or an unmeaning play. God is "the wonderful Numberer, the Numberer of secrets" (comp. פַּלְמוֹנִי, Dan. viii. 13, and the marginal note in the Auth. Vers.), and "doeth all things in *number* and measure and weight" (Wisdom xi. 20). Number is expressive of order, symmetry, proportion, and relativity. 1 is the symbol of unity or oneness, 2 of antithesis and polarity, 3 of synthesis, of the uncreated *Divinity*, the *holy Trinity* (compare the Mosaic benediction, Numb. vi. 24–26, the Trisagion, Isa. vi. 3, the baptismal formula, the apostolic benediction), 4 of *humanity* or the created *world* as the revelation of God (think of the four corners of the earth, the four seasons, the four points of the compass, the four elements, the four Gospels). From this may be explained the symbolical significance of 7 or 3+4, and of 12 or 3 × 4. Seven, being the union of 3 and 4, is the signature of the relation of God to the world, or the covenant (the Hebrew word for seven, שֶׁבַע, signifies also an *oath*, Gen. xxi. 31; xxvi. 33, and the verb שָׁבַע, *to swear*, "since seven," as Gesenius explains, "was a sacred number, and oaths were confirmed either by seven victims offered in sacrifice, Gen. xxi. 28, or by seven witnesses and pledges"). Seven figures very conspicuously in Scripture from the first institution of the sabbath in paradise to the seven churches, seven angels, seven Spirits, etc., of the Apocalypse. Creuzer observes (*Symbolik*, vol. ii. 161): "The universal sanctity of the number seven was fully acknowledged even by the ancients in all its bearings." Twelve, being the product of 3 and 4, symbolizes, from the twelve patriarchs and twelve tribes down to the twelve foundations and twelve gates of the heavenly Jerusalem, the indwelling of God in the human family, or the interpenetration of the world by the Divinity. Ten is the number of harmony and completeness, as in the ten commandments.

This whole subject has been very thoroughly discussed, with special reference to the Tabernacle where the numbers 3, 4, 10, 5, 7, and 12 control the whole structure, by Dr. CHR. W. F. BÆHR in his able and learned work: *Die Symbolik des Mosaischen Cultus*, Heidelberg, 1837, vol. i., p. 128–238, and also by H. KURTZ in the *Theol. Studien und Kritiken* for 1844, p. 315–370. Of English divines FAIRBAIRN (*Typology of Scriptures*, 2d ed., 1854, vol. ii., 87 sq.) adopts Bähr's view, as far as the number ten is concerned; TRENCH (*Epistles to the Seven Churches*, p. 83–91 of the Am. ed. of 1861), and WORDSWORTH (Com. on Matt. x. 2) with regard to 7, 3, and 4. The recent work of Dr. M. MAHAN (of the Episc. Gen. Theol. Sem. at New York): *Palmoni; or the Nu-*

* [Comp. the delineation of the leading apostles, Peter, John, Paul, and James in Schaff's *History of the Apostolic Church*, p. 437 sqq.]

merals of Scripture a Proof of Inspiration, New York, 1868 (based in great part upon Browne's *Ordo Sæculorum*, but ignoring Bähr), does not discuss, as one might infer from the title, the symbolic import of Scripture numbers, but more the relation of numbers to events and the coincidences of periods.—P. S.]

3. It is a remarkable fact, that Christ constructed His apostolate on the basis of natural relationship and of mental affinity. Six of the Apostles were brothers: viz., Peter and Andrew; James and John, the sons of Zebedee (probably cousins of the Lord; *see* Wieseler, in the *Studien u. Kritiken* for 1840, p. 648, and Winer, art. *Salome*); the sons of Alpheus—James the Younger, Judas Lebbeus, and Simon Zelotes (the cousins [?] and adoptive brothers of the Lord, commonly called His brethren). Then we read of the friendship subsisting between Philip and Bartholomew; Andrew, John, and Peter. Finally, the three last-mentioned Apostles, and perhaps some of the others also, had been disciples of John.

4. The sending forth of the disciples by two and two, indicates that none of them by himself was a sufficient representative of the fulness of Christ, and that each supplemented the other, both in the way of limitation and enlargement. This state of matters ceased after the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, when the disciples became Apostles in the full sense of the term.

5. We shall speak in another place of the breach formed among the Apostles by the apostacy of Judas, of the election of Matthias in his place, and of the calling of the Apostle Paul.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

How the Lord converts His chosen disciples into Apostles.—How He makes His redeemed fellow-workers in His work of redemption.—How the love and compassion of Christ branches out, and spreads over His people and over the world.—What we have learned in the school of the Lord must be exhibited in our life, activity, and teaching.—The call to the work of Evangelists: 1. What it implies; 2. how it presupposes one great calling; 3. how it includes many calls.—The calling of the disciples a bestowal of authority upon them by the Lord.—What power do you, who profess to hold the apostolic office, display: to cast out unclean spirits, and to heal all manner of sickness and all manner of disease among the people?—The apostolic office must appear in spiritual power, which, under God, will awaken souls to newness of life.—The twelve Apostles as representing the great features of the kingdom of God: 1. The great features of the destiny of Israel; 2. of the fulness in Christ; 3. of the Church; 4. of the kingdom of heaven in its perfectness.—The apostolic name a type of the new name which Christians are to obtain.—How personal character comes out and becomes transformed in the kingdom of God, to the glory of the Father and of Christ.—How all friendship and relationship should be subservient to the kingdom of God.—The calling of fishermen and publicans to the apostolic office an evidence of the glory of Christianity.—Judas, or the dangers of ecclesiastical office.—Even Judas must, for the time being, be acknowledged as an Apostle of the Lord.

Starke:—*Osiander:* Let us not attempt to do everything ourselves, without assistance.—*Majus:* Those who are sent into the Lord's vineyard must be properly furnished for the work.—*Bibl. Wurt.:* We must not be offended at the humble origin and the poor appearance of preachers.

Lisco:—Judas; or, even the Church of God is not absolutely pure.—The Apostles had personally seen the Lord, were called directly by Him, accredited their witness by miracles, were not bound to *one* congregation, and preached the word of God without error.

Heubner:—This mission was at the same time a trial of their teaching.

---

2. *The Mission, the Message, and the promised Support.* Ch. X. 5–10.

5 These twelve Jesus sent forth, and commanded them, saying, Go not into the way
6 of the Gentiles,[1] and into *any* [a] city of the Samaritans enter ye not: But go rather
7 to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. And as ye go, preach, saying, The kingdom
8 of heaven is at hand. Heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead,[2] cast out devils:
9 freely ye have received, freely give. Provide neither gold, nor silver, nor brass, in
10 your purses [girdles][3]; Nor scrip [bag] for *your* journey, neither [nor] two coats,
neither [nor] shoes,[4] nor yet staves [a staff][5]: for the workman is worthy of his meat.[6]

[1] Ver. 5.—[Εἰς ὁδὸν ἐθνῶν μὴ ἀπέλθητε. Ewald: *Hin zu Heiden ziehet nicht;* Lange: *Gehet nicht abwärts auf die Strasse der Heiden;* Campbell, Norton: *Go not away to Gentiles;* Conant: *Go not away to Gentiles* (omitting the article); the N. T. of the Am. Bible Union: *Go not into the way to the Gentiles; ὁδὸς ἐθνῶν = Heidenweg, i. e., way to the heathen.*—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 8.—The words: *νεκροὺς ἐγείρετε* are wanting in Codd. E., F., K., L., M., etc., in many transl., and fathers, and hence omitted by Scholz and Tischendorf. But they are supported by the important Codd. B., C., D. [and Cod. Sinait.], and old versions, and the omission may be easily explained from the fact that no raising of the dead occurred on this first mission. Griesbach and Lachmann [also Alford in the fourth edition] give the words after *θεραπεύετε*. [This is the proper order of the oldest MSS. including the Cod. Sinait., and hence Lange correctly translates: *Heal the sick, raise the dead, cleanse the lepers*, etc. So also Dr. Conant, and the N. T. of the Am. Bible Union.—P. S.]

[3] Ver. 9.—[Εἰς τὰς ζώνας; Lange: *Gürtel* (-taschen).]

[4] Ver. 10.—[More literally: *sandals*, *ὑποδήματα*. But Lange retains the more popular: *Schuhe*.]

[5] Ver. 10.—[Dr. Conant: "The Received Text, after Stephens' 3d ed. of 1550, has correctly *ῥάβδον* in the sing., as in our vernacular version from Wiclif's to the Bishops' Bible. King James' revisers, following the false reading of the Complutensian and of Stephens' first and second editions, give the plural: *staves;* perhaps to avoid an imaginary discrepancy with Mark vi. 8." Dr. Lange adopts the singular.—P. S.]

* Ver. 10.—[Lange: *Unterhalt*, *sustenance*; Conant: *living*. The Greek τροφή includes all that is necessary for support or sustenance of life.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The instruction to the Apostles is contained in vers. 5–42. The parallel passages are in the ninth, tenth, and twelfth chaps. of Luke. As Matthew was an eyewitness, we have sufficient guarantee for the accuracy of the instructions as reported by him.

Ver. 5. **The way of the Gentiles**;—*i. e.*, *to* the Gentiles, or into Gentile territory. This with special reference to their own condition, and to the circumstance that they were to take the road toward Jerusalem, as appears from the following clause.

Into any city of the Samaritans.—Samaria lay on their way from Galilee to Judæa. The Lord does not prohibit their passing through Samaria, but only their settling for evangelistic purposes, for which the time had not yet arrived. This passage, with its injunction, not to the Gentiles, nor to the Samaritans, but to the Jews, contrasts with the command after His resurrection: "Ye shall be witnesses unto Me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judæa, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth." The Lord assigns to the Samaritans a position intermediate between the Jews and the Gentiles, which is fully borne out by their history. They had greater claim on the gospel than the Gentiles, but less than the Jews. This seems to imply (what Hengstenberg denies) that they were a mixed race, whose religion consisted of a combination of Jewish and heathen elements. The Samaritans were the descendants of the heathen colonists (Gerlach: Phœnicians and Syrians?) whom Shalmaneser sent into the country after the deportation of the Ten Tribes into Assyria (2 Kings xvii. 24), and of the remnant of Israelites left behind, with whom they intermarried. When the Jews returned from the Babylonish captivity, they prevented the Samaritans from taking part in rebuilding the temple. Accordingly, the latter reared, under Sanballat and Manasseh (Neh. xiii. 28), a sanctuary of their own, on Mount Gerizim, which was destroyed by Hyrcanus, 109 B. C. The place, however, was regarded sacred, and prayer was offered there. The Jews treated the Samaritans as heretics (not absolutely as heathens). Their enmity was, perhaps, partly accounted for by the conduct of the Samaritans, who neither consistently espoused the cause of Judaism nor that of heathenism. This led to bitter hatred and jealousy between these neighboring populations. In later times, the Samaritans continued strict Monotheists, cherished the hope of a coming Messiah, and adopted the Pentateuch as their authority in matters of faith. But even then heathen elements appeared among them. *See* Acts viii.

We must not overlook the difference between μὴ ἀπέλθητε and μὴ εἰσέλθητε. The conversation between the Lord and the woman of Samaria, and His appearance in one of their cities, fully prove that this was merely a provisional arrangement for the disciples. The Lord Himself generally acted on the principle of proceeding from the particular to the universal (Matt. xv. 24), since His kingdom had first to be founded and established in Israel. But withal, He ever prosecuted His great object of extending His kingdom to the utmost boundary of the earth. This temporary limitation to Israel was, however, the condition necessary for the attainment of this object: Matt. viii. 11, etc. In the case of His disciples, He strictly insisted on this methodical procedure; and the express prohibition in this instance shows how readily the opposite might have taken place, or, in other words, how deeply they were already imbued with the spirit of catholicity. Accordingly, it is absurd to urge that this prohibition is incompatible with John iv. (Strauss), or with Matt. xxviii. 19 (Gfrörer, Köstlin). Heubner: To have sent the disciples to the Gentiles and the Samaritans, would have been to close the way to the hearts of the Jews. A people had first to be gathered among them, for theirs were the calling and the promises. During Christ's brief ministry on earth, there was neither time nor room for going beyond the boundaries of Canaan.

Ver. 8. **Raise the dead.**—"The first instance in which the dead were raised by apostolic agency, occurs in the Book of Acts (ix. 36); but the Seventy reported on their return, that the evil spirits were subject to them, Luke x. 17." Gerlach.

Freely ye have received.—This refers both to their teaching, and to the miraculous help which they were to bring.

Ver. 9. **In your purses**, or rather **girdles.**—The girdle of the upper garment served at the same time as purse. In the East, the rich wear pockets in their dresses.—**Neither gold, nor silver, nor brass** (copper, small coins; Vulg.: *pecunia*). A descending climax, showing that even the least profit from their office was prohibited; but implying neither a vow of poverty nor of mendicancy, in the popish sense. They were to introduce the great principle, that the messengers of the gospel had claim on daily support and free hospitality.

Ver. 10. The prohibition to provide themselves with two under garments, and to bestow care on travelling shoes and travelling staves, may have been a symbolical mode of enjoining that they were rather to *stay* in one place, than to *hurry* from one to another,—in general, that they were to be lightly attired, and free of care. Perhaps the word ὑποδήματα means travelling shoes in the strict sense, as distinguished from σανδάλια. The ὑπόδημα κοῖλον refers to the Roman *calceus*. According to Mark, they were not to put on two under garments. This is merely a stronger expression. But it may be regarded as intended by way of *explanation*, that in that Gospel the messengers of Christ are directed to take a staff, and to be shod with sandals. This staff of which Mark speaks, is not to be understood as in opposition to several staves (hence, perhaps, the reading ῥάβδους, in several Codd.), but to a larger outfit for the journey. Hence the two accounts substantially agree. They were not to concern themselves about the staff, far less to make a profit of it by their office.

For the workman is worthy of his meat [living].—This serves as key to the preceding passage. Their maintenance and their office were not to be severed. They were to trust to their office for their maintenance, and their maintenance was to be exclusively for their office (1 Cor. ix. 14; Gal. vi. 6). Olshausen rightly calls attention to the difference of times expressed in Luke xxii. 35. Among those who were prepared to receive the gospel, they required no provision for the future; not so among enemies, although in that case also anxious care was to be banished (*see* ver. 19). The laborer is ἄξιος, *wor-*

thy,—indicating his personal value, of which he should be conscious with dignity, *i. e.*, with humility and confidence.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

The instructions which the Lord gave to His ambassadors, were, in the first place, intended for their first mission. But the terms are so pregnant, the directions so deep in their bearing, and so general in their application, that they may be taken as the type of all the commissions given by Christ to His servants. This remark applies, first, to the *aim* of their mission, viz., to the lost sheep of the house of Israel; *i. e.*, in the first place, always to those who are *most willing and prepared* to receive the truth, as well as to the *most needy*. Next, as to the negative direction about their way, we gather that we are not to reverse the Divine order and arrangement in preaching the gospel,—a rule which Paul invariably followed, Acts xvi. 6, 9. Then, as to their *commission*. They are, (*a*) to preach: to announce that the kingdom of heaven is at hand. (*b*) To confirm their word, —1. by *quickening*,—healing the sick, and even raising the dead; 2. by *purifying*,—cleanse the lepers, cast out devils. The servants of Christ must always aim after these two effects in their activity.—Lastly, as to their *reward*. Freely they receive, freely they give. And yet there is no need for care, since the laborer is worthy of support. The preaching of the gospel must never be degraded into an ordinary worldly employment; nor, on the other hand, should the evangelist be afraid or ashamed to accept of sufficient support from those to whom he preaches, and that according to their own mode of living. We are unfit for building up the kingdom of heaven, or of self-sacrificing love, if we approach the work in a spirit of *covetousness* or of anxious *care*, distrusting the supplies of the Church. That this freedom from care does not exclude necessary provision, as indicated by our circumstances and by those of the persons around us, nor the careful preservation of such provision, appears from the history of the miraculous feeding of the multitude. In both these instances there was a small provision, and a larger one was preserved. Gerlach mentions the cloak of Paul as a case in point, 2 Tim. iv. 13. But this last circumstance also shows how free from all outward care the Apostles had been.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Christ sending forth His messengers: 1. The messengers; 2. the aim; 3. the way; 4. the message; 5. the price (freely, in the love of Christ); 6. the provision and the support.—The mission of the twelve Apostles, in its continuance to the end of the world. —Fulfilment of the prediction, "How beautiful upon the mountains!" etc., Isa. lii. 7.—How Divine wisdom orders the way of Divine love: 1. As need increases, help enlarges; 2. through limitation to universality; 3. from those who are most susceptible, to those who are less susceptible; 4. through the quickening of the people of God, to that of the world.—True and false separatism, as distinguished from true and false universalism, in the spread of the faith.—Missionary zeal must accommodate itself to right order, and move in the right direction.—How does the Lord indicate the manner in which to carry on His work? 1. By His word; 2. by the history of His kingdom; 3. by His spirit.—The eternal obligation to carry the gospel to the Jews, as derived from the injunction to go to the lost sheep of the house of Israel.—Symbolical meaning of the injunction: 1. To go to the lost; 2. to the lost sheep; 3. to those on whom the hope of the Church rests.—The message of salvation: 1. An announcement of the kingdom of heaven by the word; 2. an exhibition of the word of God by deeds. —How the ambassadors of the Church must prove their Divine mission: 1. By healing the sick, not by torturing the whole; 2. by raising the dead, not by killing the living; 3. by cleansing the lepers (heretics), not by representing as heretics those who are pure; 4. by casting out devils, not by setting them free.—*Freely ye have received, freely give:* the fundamental principle for the spread of the kingdom of God.—Freedom from care of the messengers of Jesus.—The pilgrims lightly attired, carrying in their hearts the treasures of heaven: 1. Outwardly, unburdened; 2. inwardly, laden with the greatest riches. —The laborer is worthy of his hire; or, those who publish the gospel should live by the gospel.

Starke:—The kingdom of Christ is not earthly, nor of this world, but consists of heavenly and spiritual treasures.—The office of the ministry is not a trade.—*Quesnel*:—What it is to have neither gold nor silver in our scrips, but to have them in our hearts.—A true minister of the gospel is not hindered by anything in his mission, but is ever ready to go.—Duty of the Church to maintain its ministers.

Gerlach:—Disinterestedness one of the great characteristics of the servants of Christ.—The grace of God is free, even though it be communicated by the instrumentality of man.

Heubner:—Go not whither inclination carries, but whither God sends you.—The greed of Gehazi punished.—Ministers must not seek their own ease or advancement.

---

3. *Special Direction of the Apostles to pious households. Reception and Rejection.* CH. X. 11–15.

11 And into whatsoever city or town ye shall enter, inquire who in it is worthy; and
12 there abide till ye go thence. And when ye come into a [the, τήν] house, salute it.
13 And if the house be worthy, let your peace come upon it: but if it be not worthy, let
14 your peace return to you. And whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear your words,
15 when ye depart out of that house or city, shake off the dust of your feet. Verily I say
unto you, It shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrha in the day of
judgment, than for that city.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 11. **Inquire who in it is worthy.**—A still further limitation. They were to go to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, and to inquire who among them were worthy, *i. e.*, susceptible, or pious Israelites. This question could only be answered according to objective marks, as the Searcher of hearts alone knew their state and disposition.

And there abide.—*Continuance* in a place, the formation of a centre, so to speak, in opposition to transient and broken activity.

Ver. 12. **And when ye come into the House**—*i. e.*, the house of him who is worthy (Meyer)—salute it.—The common Eastern salutation had in this instance a twofold meaning;—1. being an offer of spiritual fellowship in the peace which they bring to the worthy; 2. being addressed to the whole household, for the sake of the worthy person who was at the head of it.

And if the house be worthy.—Not of your salutation (Fritzsche), but of your abiding (Meyer). —**Let your peace come upon it.**—The Lord Himself ratifies by His peace, their salutation of peace. —**Let your peace return to you**;—*i. e.*, it shall be taken from that household, and returned to you. That household itself shall become poorer, but the disciples shall be all the richer and more joyous. But the expression also indicates that no further fellowship should be held with such households, Isa. lv. 11.

Ver. 14. **And whosoever.**—The word, *whosoever*, refers to persons who were worthy, as being the representatives of worthy households and towns. The meaning, however, is not, that on the first failure they were to avoid a house or a town, but, that if they were personally not received, they should leave first the household, and then the town. Of course, even the first failure would appear ominous, as the disciples had previously made the necessary inquiries. "*To shake off the dust of the feet*,—a sign of contempt, as in the case of the heathen. The Jews taught, *pulverem terræ ethnicæ ex contactu inquinare*. Lightfoot, *Horæ*, 331. Mishna, Surenhusius vi. Wetstein, comp. Acts xiii. 21." Meyer. But the action must be regarded rather as symbolical of complete cessation of all fellowship, of renunciation of all influence, and hence as an announcement of impending judgment, but not as a mark of contempt. The explanations of de Wette—"have nothing to do with them," and of Ewald—"calmly, as if nothing had happened," fall far short of the import of the passage.

Ver. 15. **The land of Sodom**;—*i. e.*, the inhabitants of those doomed cities. The higher the spiritual offer rejected, the greater their sin. In Sodom, only the weak testimony of Lot had been heard; but to reject the Evangelists, marked the climax of guilt (Matt. xi. 20; Luke xii. 47).—Unbelief is a second fall (John iii. 36).

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. These directions of the Lord imply a telling argument against extreme individualism, and for the extension of the gospel blessings over whole households. The Lord sends His disciples to worthy heads of families, and, through them, to their whole households. On account of the worthiness of the head of the family, the whole household is generally received into spiritual fellowship. And although there may be divisions in the house with reference to Christ, ver. 35, even these prove that, in itself and in its nature, the family must be regarded as a spiritual unit. Nowhere do we meet in such cases with a distinction of believing and indifferent persons, but only with that of believing and unbelieving; it is not majors or minors, but friends or foes of Jesus. The latter break up the natural unity and fellowship of the family. Thus the proto-evangel was destined for the *house* of Adam; the ark contained the *household* of Noah (although Ham formed one of them); the promise was to Abraham and his *household*; and circumcision was the bond of unity for the *house* of Israel. Similarly, the Apostles planted the Church in believing *families* (Acts x.; xvi.; 1 Cor. i. 16). The question, whether in every case children were baptized or not, is comparatively of little importance. The Anabaptist principle overlooks the Divine institution of the *family*, and its import in the Church, the interchange between spiritual and natural communion, and the idea of *extended personality*, the germ of the Church, which every apostolic household formed (1 Cor. vii. 14).

2. *First rule:* To inquire for those who are worthy (not to go by haphazard). *Second rule:* To salute a worthy household—to receive them into the fellowship of evangelical peace. Promise; comfort. *Third rule:* To break off fellowship, and to announce judgment, in case they were not received. Yet not rashly. It is said, "Whosoever shall not receive you" (*i. e.*, decided rejection), "nor hear your words" (where this also is decided), then only, etc.—Hence, either the baptism of the Spirit or that of fire [of judgment]. One of the two must come.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

First object of interest to the messengers of Christ when entering a city or town.—Apostolical inquiry for the best lodgings.—We may learn even from unbelievers who are the pious.—Who is worthy of Christ's message of peace?—How Christ has converted the common salutation into an evangelical message of peace.—"There abide till ye go thence."—The disciples sent to the family.—To salute the house, means to receive it into fellowship.—The salutation of the disciples is the blessing of the Master.—The gracious house.—Your peace shall return to you: 1. Unbelievers will not keep it; 2. it will be added to the believing messengers: they shall not be cast down, but encouraged.—To shake off the dust of the feet, as the expression of solemn separation: 1. An expression of calmness, of freedom, and of purity; 2. of being innocent of the judgment which shall befall the unbelievers; 3. of the cessation of fellowship; 4. the last sermon, a threatening of judgment.—The rejection of the gospel: the judgment.—Solemn import of hours and days of grace.—Different degrees of guilt and of judgment.

Starke:—*Quesnel*: Ministers should love to take up their abode with pious people.—*Majus*: The treasures of the gospel must not be forced upon people.—*Osiander*: Contempt of the gospel destroys realms and countries, and plunges them into everlasting misery.

Lisco:—They were to remain satisfied with the house in which they were, and not to leave it merely for the sake of more ease and comfort in another.—They were not to intrude themselves.

Gerlach:—Your peace will return to you: a com-

fort for the laborers in the vineyard.—Dust off the feet. Luther: Ye shall take nothing at all from them, that they may know that you had sought not your own advantage, but their salvation.

Heubner:—God has His children in every place.—We must seek them out.—Pious people soon find out each other.—Ministers must appeal to the sympathies of those who are susceptible.—Christ regards the rejection of His disciples as that of His own word and person.

---

4. *Trials waiting the Messengers of Jesus. "Among wolves."* CH. X. 16–18.

16 Behold, I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves: be ye therefore wise as
17 serpents, and harmless [simple][1] as doves. But beware of men; for they will deliver
you up to the councils [συνέδρια, *spiritual* tribunals], and they will scourge you in their
18 synagogues [as supposed heretics]; And ye shall be brought before governors and kings
[*secular* tribunals][2] for my sake, for a testimony [μαρτύριον] against [to] them and the
Gentiles [αὐτοῖς καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν].

[1] Ver. 16.—[Ἀκέραιοι, etym. (from κεράννυμι and α privativum) *unmixed, simple, pure.* So Meyer after the Etym. Mag.: ὁ μὴ κεκραμένος κακοῖς, ἀλλ' ἁπλοῦς καὶ ἀποίκιλος. Comp. Rom. xvi. 19; Phil. ii. 15. Lange: *ohne Falsch*, and in parenthesis, *arglos, rein.* Bengel, however, *in loc.*, explains ἀκέραιοι, "*sine cornu*, ungula, dente, aculeo: innoxii active, atque adeo etiam passive."—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 18.—[The proper order after the Greek, as observed in Lange's German version, would require this change: "But also before governors and kings shall ye be brought," καὶ ἐπὶ ἡγεμόνας δὲ καὶ βασιλεῖς ἀχθήσεσθε.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 16. **Behold, I send you forth.**—We note the gradation by which Christ prepares His disciples for persecution. 1. They were not to expect enrichment, but to obtain subsistence; 2. they were to expect rejection; they were to anticipate that even terrible persecutions would befall them. This, however, only after He had announced the judgment impending over unbelievers. "Behold, I send you." The Lord rapidly passes to the painful experience awaiting them. "The emphasis rests on ἐγώ: I am He who sends you into such dangerous circumstances." Meyer. But the expression also implies the gracious protection which would attend them (Theophylact, Beza, Bengel).

In the midst of wolves: ἐν μέσῳ, not εἰς, *into*, etc.*—The disciples are not sent to the wolves as such, but in the midst of wolves, in order to seek out those who would receive the kingdom. The meekest and most defenceless messengers of peace are commissioned to execute their work among the most furious, powerful, and, as it would appear to man, unconquerable opponents of the truth. Even at this early stage, Christ opens to their view the sufferings which awaited them as Apostles, that so they might courageously, and yet carefully, go forth into the world. Sheep in the midst of wolves are to all human appearance wholly lost;—what, then, were they to do? The wolves here signify not only cunning, but also malignant disposition and hatred of truth and of Christ; for it is the favorite chase of wolves to break into a herd of sheep. But here the old story is reversed: a few sheep invade the territory of wolves.

In the midst of these *wolves*, the *sheep* were, so to speak, to become transformed into *serpents* and *doves*; *i. e.*, to deport themselves with the wisdom of serpents, and the simplicity or harmlessness of doves. In virtue of the former quality, they would be able to avoid persecution without incurring guilt; in virtue of the latter, to encounter persecution without compromising their principles. These qualities are opposed to each other; they never occur combined in nature, nor in the natural disposition of man. But the Spirit of Christ combines in higher unity these natural antagonisms. The serpent slips innumerable times from the hand of the pursuer, and the dove does not settle in any unclean place,—it approaches him who is gentle, and will never do harm to the persecutor; its safety lies in flying upward. Lastly, the dove is a symbol of the soul rising in prayer and faith, and ultimately rising above death and the grave.*

Ver. 17. **But beware of men.**—In order to occupy a right position with reference to persecutors, you must beware of *men* generally, whose weakness frequently degenerates into treachery.—The **councils**, or Sanhedrim, were the spiritual judicatories connected with the synagogues of the country, where the sentence of scourging pronounced upon heretics was executed. (Comp. Winer [and W. Smith], sub *Synagogues.*)

Ver. 18. **But also before governors and kings.**—A gradation. They are to be brought not only before spiritual, but also before secular judges, as if they were common criminals. The ἡγεμόνες, *governors*, were the provincial authorities, consisting of the Proprætors, the Proconsuls, and the Procurators. The term *kings* embraces the rulers of Palestine, of other countries, and of the Roman Empire. In short, the passage applies to all civil magistrates and rulers.

For a testimony.—These trials will result in a

* [So also Bengel, *Gnomon in loc.*: "ἐν μέσῳ, *in medio*: non *in medium*. Tam estis inter lupos." Maldonatus, on the contrary, confounds the two prepositions here: "*In medium*, ἐν pro εἰς, sicut Hebraice בְּ pro אֶל, בְּקֶרֶב."—P. S.]

* [Wordsworth, quoting from Hilary and Jerome: "It is said that the serpent shows his wisdom in guarding his head, whatever other part of his body is struck. So let us be ready to sacrifice anything but our faith; or, let us guard our head, Christ." The innocence of the dove, says Jerome, is shown in likeness to the Holy Ghost.—P. S.]

testimony of the Lord, their martyrdom being the highest spiritual confirmation of the Gospel both to the Jews and to the Gentiles. Such was the final object of these persecutions, applying, as Meyer rightly suggests, to their testimony both before secular and spiritual judges. We also agree with Him in referring the word αὐτοῖς to the Jews, and not the governors and kings, who were themselves the Gentiles. Accordingly, we have the following succession—first, martyrdom to the Jews, then to the Gentiles. The Jews are here the representatives of all the later sufferings of the Christians, as, indeed, the Judaizing spirit in the Middle Ages was the real cause of the persecutions of believers during that period. Meyer rejects the explanation εἰς ἔλεγχον αὐτῶν, proposed by Chrysostom. But we must bear in mind that the ἔλεγχος is the effect of the μαρτύριον,—to the one, to repentance; and to the others, who hardened themselves, to judgment.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The Lord here sets before us the essential characteristics of true martyrdom, by which we may judge every martyrdom which has taken place. One inference at least is plain, viz., that martyrdom cannot be avoided by any exercise of wisdom or caution. Such, then, is the certain prospect opened to faithful witnesses. But the object of their sufferings is correspondingly glorious. Their martyrdom was to serve to Jews and Gentiles as the final confirmation of the gospel, and hence to manifest its highest effects.

2. The Sanhedrims, or spiritual tribunals, whether composed of great or of small hierarchs, have always been in the van in the persecution of evangelists. (The theologians of Jena, in 1561, were wont to say of the Lutheran consistories, that in Rome there was only one Pope, but in Weimar, nine!) Then come the synagogues, or the historical religious associations. At last, the act of real treason ensues, when spiritual matters are handed over to secular judges (according to the hypocritical principle: *ecclesia non sitit sanguinem*), and governors and kings, incited by a furious rabble, become persecutors of the truth. What then? Beware of men: of men in their inhuman human passions.

3. What Christ here predicted to His disciples (including Judas), He Himself first experienced.

4. A life-picture of fanaticism in the people. Ver. 21 follows a life-picture of fanaticism in the family.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Christ sends His witnesses as sheep in the midst of wolves: 1. Apparent hopelessness of the mission (sheep, wolves); 2. the miraculous deliverance (like serpents, like doves).—How the councils of the Jews and the scourging in the synagogues were re-enacted in the Middle Ages (the Inquisition, torture, Crusades).—Martyrdom, as predicted by the Lord: 1. Its development; 2. its certainty; 3. its glorious aim.—The contrast between martyrdom and fanaticism.—All fanaticism is unchristian, and becomes at last antichristian, even where it professes to defend the cause of Christ.

Starke:—The cross, not outward prosperity, the sign of the true Church.—*Gerhard*: *Sit serpentinus oculus in corde columbino.*—Even to this day, the witnesses of Christ are charged with sedition and heresy.—*Quesnel*: A minister must not be afraid to tell the truth even to kings.*—What comfort in persecutions, that we suffer for Christ's sake!

Gossner:—Patience under persecution for Christ's sake is the greatest mark of true discipleship, greater even than miracles. It is itself the greatest miracle. The devil may imitate miracles, but he cannot inspire patience.

Heubner:—In a certain sense, this applies to all Christians: they are in this world as sheep in the midst of wolves.—The people of God ever cherish kindly, trustful, and affectionate feelings; but are met on every side by malice.—Christians who are innocently condemned by worldly tribunals, may feel themselves infinitely superior to them: time shall be, when they will be the judges of their accusers.—*God often so disposes it, that preachers of righteousness, who otherwise would not have access to princes, should be brought before them in bonds.*

* [Quesnel adds what Starke and Lange omit: "*but with abundance of prudence* (with the wisdom of the serpent). He who flatters them, makes himself an accomplice of their sins."—P. S.]

5. *Care about their Defence.* CH. X. 19, 20.

19 But when they deliver you up,[1] take no [anxious][2] thought how or what ye shall
speak: for[3] it shall be given you in that same hour [in that hour] what ye shall speak.
20 For it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you.

[1] Ver. 19.—[Dr. Lange reads with Codd. B., E., Sinait., etc., and Lachmann παραδῶσιν, *tradiderint*, instead of παραδιδῶσιν, *tradent*.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 19.—[Μὴ μεριμνήσητε. Comp. the exegetical note on chap. vi. 25, p. 138, and the remark of MALDONATUS *in loc.*: "*Non omnem præcedentem meditationem vetat; sed eam quæ diffidentiam divinæ providentiæ et opis habeat, quæque nimio metu ac sollicitudine liberam Evangelii prædicationem impediat.*" BENGEL: "*Una, non curandi, cura sit. Non omnis præparatio ex eo nobis prohibetur.* 1 Tim. iv. 15; coll. Luc. xxi. 14; 1 Cor. xiv. 26."—P. S.]

[3] Ver. 19.—Some Codd., D., L., al., omit the words from δοθήσεται to λαλήσετε, probably misled by the similarity of sound with the preceding.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 19. **How or what.**—The form and the substance; πῶς ἢ τί.—We might have expected that the latter would have been first mentioned; but, in planning an address, the first care is always about the form. [Bengel: "Ubi τὸ *quid* obtigit, τὸ *quomodo* non deest. . . . Spiritus non loquitur sine ver-

bis. *Dabo vobis os et sapientiam*, Luc. xxi. 15."—P. S.]

Ver. 20. [**It is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father**, etc.—An indirect argument for the inspiration of the apostolic writings. For if the Holy Spirit suggested their oral testimony of Christ, He filled them still more in the act of writing, since books are permanent, and can be read by all. Comp. John xv. 26, 27.—**Your Father.**—It is remarkable that our Lord never says *our* Father, except in the Lord's Prayer, which He taught His disciples, but *My* Father, or *your* Father; for He is the eternal and only begotten Son of the Father, we are children by adoption through faith in Him.—P. S.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. In captivity, a person would naturally feel anxious how to defend himself, especially if he were to appear before the great, the learned, or the powerful of this world. The desire to speak well would be all the stronger, that they were deeply conscious of their innocence, and hence felt no concern on that point. But Christ knew better than any other how studied eloquence restrains and obstructs, perhaps even suppresses, the warm outgushings of the heart; how anxiety to hit upon the right word may suppress the faith from which alone that right word can flow; and how deep spiritual life quickens and calls into being appropriate exercises of the mind, so that, in every situation of life, we shall find both the right thought and the right word. Compare the speech of Paul against Tertullus in Acts xxiv.

2. *It shall be given you.* This is further explained by, "*for it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father.*" The contrast is absolute, and so is the doctrine of inspiration which results from it. All personal anxiety must disappear in the anticipation of the Spirit of the Father, who overrules all the events of life, and can not only fill His people with joy and peace, but elevate them to moral heroism. But when we say that *all self* and self-seeking are completely to cease, we do not mean that our intellectual faculties are to be overpowered and bound by a foreign influence (as in Montanism), but only that they are to be set free from all lower motives, and to be spiritually raised and quickened. Hence the inspiration promised will be of a moral rather than of a psychical character. For the removal of all selfishness and self-seeking implies, at the same time, the full development of the deepest spiritual motives and views. The Lord presents these future events as immediately impending, because the conduct of the disciples, when imprisoned, depends on their general relationship to the Father, which had already commenced at that time. Comp. Calvin's reply to the confessors of the gospel imprisoned at Paris, in Henry's Calvin, i. 467.

3. The inference of the inspiration of Scripture, derived from this and similar passages, is quite legitimate. Only, that the great point in inspiration is the τί, to which the πῶς is quite subordinate. Hence, in the promise given, we read only of the τί, not of the πῶς. Similarly, the promise is simply δοθήσεται τί λαλήσετε, not λαλήσητε.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The prohibition of carefulness about answering before councils, in its relation to the general prohibition of carefulness, Matt. vi. 34.—Carefulness may reappear, even in the Christian life, in the guise of piety, or in that of official zeal.—Take no thought for the *how* and the *what*, and the *what* shall supply the *how*.—Carefulness about rhetorical ornaments,* in its dangers: 1. It springs from anxiety, and *restrains* the spiritual life; 2. it manifests itself by excitement and excess, and *adulterates* the spiritual life; 3. it leads to weariness or self-seeking, and *destroys* the spiritual life.—The putting aside of every false preparation, as giving place to true preparation: prayer, meditation, and inward conflict (*oratio, meditatio, tentatio*). *For it is not you*, etc. 1. An instruction as to the inspiration of the word by the Spirit of God; 2. an admonition not to put in our own word; 3. a promise that the Lord will speak by us.—When the orator has wholly disappeared, the True Orator shall appear.

Heubner:—Consciousness of innocence, and of the goodness of the cause in which we are engaged, is the best defence.—A Christian will leave his defence to God.—A Christian must not shape his own course, but leave himself to the guidance of God; there should always be quietness and Sabbath-rest in his soul.—The Holy Ghost the Comforter of the simple.—Proper sermons are they which are given by the Holy Ghost, not those which are artificially constructed.

* [In German: *Geistliche Schönrednerei*, for which I know no English equivalent.—P. S.]

---

6. *Severity of the impending Persecution, to the extent of breaking the bonds of Natural Relationship. Greatness of the Persecution, its measure, and glorious end.* Ch. X. 21, 22.

21 And the brother shall deliver up the brother to death, and the father the child:[1]
and the children shall rise up against *their* parents,[2] and cause them to be put to death.
22 And ye shall be hated of [by] all *men*[3] for my name's sake: but he that endureth to
the end shall be saved.

[1] Ver. 21.—[Dr. Conant omits the art. as in Greek, and renders: "*And brother will* (for *shall*) *deliver up brother to death, and father child.*" But the latter clause shows that it will not do in English. The N. T. of the Am. Bible Union has restored the article before every noun. Lange also gives the art.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 21.—[Here where the plural is used, it is better to omit the art.: *children will rise up against parents* τέκνα ἐπὶ γονεῖς. So Conant, N. T. of the A. B. U., Lange (*Kinder gegen Eltern*).—P. S.]

[3] Ver. 22.—[The interpolated *men* of the C. V. is quite unnecessary.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 21. **Will rise up,** ἐπαναστήσονται.—The verb means insurrection in the strictest sense,—being in this case equally directed against parental authority and the Spirit of Christ. This inward rebellion leads to the corresponding outward sin of parricide, either by delivering up parents to the magistrates, or by inciting fanatical vengeance. Again, the brother and the father show their hatred to their brother or child by the παραδιδόναι, or delivering them up to death—a term which also implies treason and vileness.

Ver. 22. **Ye shall be hated by all.**—This strong expression (though without the article) indicates the generality of the hatred toward Christ. It will spread over the world like an infectious fever, or a pestilence, and furnish the material with which, on any given occasion, the fire of persecution may be lit up.

For My name's sake;—*i. e.*, purely on account of their Christian profession, and not on account of the personal blemishes and errors which may mingle with it.

But he that endureth—viz., faithful to his profession—**to the end.**—To the individual, the end is martyrdom by death, or else deliverance; to the Church as a whole, the end is the complete victory of its distinctive confession of Christ over the hatred of the world. In both these respects sufferings shall have an end. There are different interpretations of the expression εἰς τέλος (the end of these sufferings; of life; the destruction of Jerusalem, etc.).*—**Shall be saved.**—Here *very* emphatically, absolutely σωθήσεται. The end of this way is salvation (Luke xxi. 19), while every side-path leads to destruction.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

Christianity is based on a new spiritual relationship, and its effects—of love or of hatred—are much stronger and wider than the natural bonds which connect human society. Hence hatred of the gospel assumes a demoniac shape, and wickedly dissolves all the sacred bonds of nature. But even this fearful outburst must not shake the confidence of believers in the holy Name which they profess. It only serves to convince them of the depth of human corruption. In the name of Christ they shall ultimately succeed in transforming the natural bonds which connect man to man, and by the love of Christ shall they overcome the hatred of the world. Not that Christianity itself endangers the bonds of natural relationship, but that it becomes the innocent occasion of such hatred. But here also the name of Christ shall prevail, and a higher bond of unity shall bind together His own.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Hatred of Christ is necessarily murderous in its character,—1. because Christ is life; 2. because sin is real death.—The two great forms in which hatred of Christ appears, are betrayal and rebellion.—Profession of Christ revealing the deep ruin of the world, as apparent in the hatred of Jesus and His people.—The hatred and persecution of the gospel an evidence of its power and loftiness.—Fanaticism in its relation to faith: 1. It dissolves all the bonds of life and of love, but imputes the blame of it to faith; 2. it leads a man to acts of betrayal, of rebellion, and of murder, while he imagines that he is offering services acceptable to God; 3. it institutes a community of hatred in opposition to the community of love, and mistakes the fire of hell for a sacred flame of heaven; 4. it appears in the guise of religion, but for the purpose of banishing Christ and His religion from the earth.—Final preservation of all things in Christ, despite the enmity of the world. 1. The family and friendship shall be preserved, though dissolved in various ways; 2. humanity, despite its enmity; 3. our own life, although we surrender it.—"But he that endureth to the end shall be saved."—Faithfulness to the Lord the condition of safety.

Starke:—There is no hatred in the world so great as that against Christ and His members.—The world imputes every evil to Christians, although itself is the sole cause of it.—God has put enmity between the seed of the woman and the seed of the serpent.

Lisco:—In measure as these sufferings are painful, the reward is glorious. 1. The sufferings: *a.* persecution by our nearest relatives; *b.* general hatred. 2. The reward: deliverance, blessedness.

Heubner:—It is evidence of the highest love to renounce love for the sake of Christ.

* ["Enduring to the end" is the proper evidence of the reality and solidity of the Christian profession, "drawing back unto perdition" exposes the want of foundation. It often occurs in connection with similar warnings, Matt. xxiv. 13 (he that shall endure unto the end); 1 Cor. i. 8 (confirm you unto the end); Hebr. iii. 6 (firm unto the end); iii. 14 (steadfast unto the end); vi. 11; x. 23, 26-29; Rev. ii. 26 (who keepeth my works unto the end). The phrase has therefore obviously a universal applicability to all believers, and to the end of individual life (τέλος = *finis vitæ*). But this does not exclude a special reference to great future epochs in a prophetical discourse like this (comp. ver. 23). Hence τέλος may be referred directly to the destruction of Jerusalem (comp. ver. 23 and xxiv. 13), and indirectly to the final judgment which was foreshadowed and typified by the former. So σωθήσεται, likewise, was literally fulfilled in the timely escape of the Christians from the doomed city by Divine admonition, and will be absolutely fulfilled in the everlasting salvation. Compare the prophetic discourses of the Saviour in ch. xxiv and Commentary.—P. S.]

---

7. *Flight in Persecution, the means of spreading Christianity.* **First warning and comfort.** CH. X. 23.

23 But when they persecute you in this city, flee ye into another [the other, εἰς τὴν ἄλλην]:[1] for verily I say unto you, Ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel, till the Son of man be come [shall have come].

[1] Ver. 23.—Griesbach with many Codd. minusc.: εἰς τὴν ἑτέραν, κἂν ἐκ ταύτης διώκωσιν ὑμᾶς, φεύγετε εἰς τὴν ἄλλην. A later amplification. [Lachmann reads: εἰς τὴν ἑτέραν, and puts the words from κἂν to ἄλλην in brackets. Tischendorf, Alford, Wordsworth read simply: εἰς τὴν ἄλλην. The Cod. Sinait.: ἑτέραν. The def. art. before ἄλλην or ἑτέραν denotes the next city in order which had not yet been visited, and shows that there will be always some other city to fly to.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 23. **For verily,** ἀμὴν γάρ.—The γάρ here is of the greatest importance. The flight of an Apostle from a city where general persecution had arisen, was in reality not flight, but removal to a larger sphere of usefulness. This duty may be deduced from the fundamental principle formerly enjoined, of turning away from those who were hardened, and addressing themselves more and more to those who were impressible.—"Shake off the dust of your feet." But, on the other hand, this alone must be the motive for their flight. Subordinate considerations (such as employment, home, etc.) must not retain, nor fear of suffering drive them away. Their flight must be determined by concern for the best means of spreading the name of Christ, that so the natural instinct of self-preservation may be transformed into a spiritual principle.

Ye shall not have gone over, *ended, finished, completed,* οὐ μὴ τελέσητε.—Scarcely equivalent to, "Ye shall not have been in all the cities." Meyer.—"To bring them to Christian perfection." Maldonatus, Hoffmann, etc. The expression implies an active finishing of their mission. Hence the interpretation of Meyer is too narrow; that of Maldonatus, too wide. The meaning is: ye shall have abundant room for your labors.

Shall have come, ἔλθῃ.—1. Until the victory of the cause of Christ (Baumgarten-Crusius); 2. to the destruction of Jerusalem (Michaelis, etc.); 3. to the out-pouring of the Holy Spirit (Calvin and others); 4. till help shall have been afforded by the Son of Man (Chrysostom); 5. till the second coming of Christ (Meyer). But the commentators forget that the Apostles only preceded Christ, and that this passage refers in the first place to that particular mission. Hence we explain it: till the Son of Man shall overtake you. (So also Heubner.) The expression is, however, also symbolical, and applies to the Church generally. In this sense, it points forward to the second coming of Christ; including at the same time the idea, that their apostolic labors in Judæa would be cut short by the judgment impending upon Jerusalem.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. Having set before the disciples the sufferings and dangers of their work, the Lord now encourages and comforts them. The verse under consideration furnishes the first consolation. Their sufferings would be diminished from the higher obligation incumbent on them to spread the gospel, whereby flight became a sacred duty.

2. "But what constitutes their highest comfort in this respect, is the promise, that the witnesses of Christ shall always find new spheres of labor, and that the Lord shall ever follow them, both with the baptism of the Spirit and of grace, and with that of fire and of judgment." The fundamental idea of this statement, so far as the kingdom of heaven is concerned, is, that the work of Christ shall not be completed by quiet and calm progress, until the last place and the last individual shall have been converted, but by great contests between light and darkness, and amid great catastrophes which shall usher in the judgment.

3. If it be asked, how this direction can be reconciled with the journey of Jesus to Jerusalem, where, as He knew, death awaited Him; we reply, that Christ left Galilee, where, from the hostility of the Jewish priesthood, every door was shut against Him, and went to Jerusalem, where a multitude was prepared to receive Him. In His care for the people, the Messiah readily encountered every danger, which, indeed, required to be met in the accomplishment of His work. He went to keep the feast at Jerusalem, in order to seek the lost sheep of the house of Israel in the midst of wolves. This may serve to furnish a rule and a precedent for our conduct under persecution. If we are bound by promise, by duty, by our ministry, or by the prospect of carrying out our calling, we must not flee from danger, nay, if necessary, go to meet it. But if these very motives point beyond the reach of danger, it is our duty to flee. To labor, is the object; to suffer, only the means toward it. It was an error of the Montanists to regard the obligation to suffer as paramount to that of working. Thus Tertullian (*De fuga in persecutione*) disapproved of flight under any circumstances, and regarded this commandment only local and temporary. In this respect, however, the Apostle Paul, and, at later periods, St. Athanasius (*Apologia pro fuga sua*), Luther (on the Wartburg), and Calvin [who fled twice from France, and was once expelled from Geneva], may serve as our models.

[Flight in persecution, from selfish regard to personal safety and comfort, is an act of cowardice and sin; but flight from conscientious conviction of duty to God and to the Church, is right, and commanded by Christ, and sanctioned by the conduct of the Apostles and martyrs (as Polycarp and Cyprian). The ancient Church rejected the fanatical and Montanistic view of Tertullian, which condemned the flight in persecution without qualification. Augustine says, a minister may flee if his flock is scattered by flight, or if he can do more good by fleeing than by remaining (*quandocumque plus fugiendo quam manendo juvare potest*). Chrysostom thinks, we may flee, provided we do not thereby deny Christ, or endanger the faith; otherwise, we must risk our life for the sheep, which the hireling will not do. MALDONATUS *ad loc.*: "*Cum Evangelium ipsum, propter quod fugiendum non est, postulat ut fugiamus, fugiendum est. Tunc fugere non metus, sed pietas: non fugere non fortitudo, sed pertinacia est. Hac de causa D. Paulum fugisse legimus. Major gloria Dei et Ecclesiæ utilitas regula nobis esse debet; cum aut utraque, aut alterutra ut fugiamus a nobis exigit, non fugere peccatum est.*" WORDSWORTH on φεύγετε, ver. 23: "It was a question discussed in early times, whether *fuga in persecutione* was under any circumstances allowable. Tertullian (*De fuga in persecutione*) argues that our Lord's permission was only temporary; but this is contravened by St. Jerome (*Catal. Script.* in *Tertullian*). *See* also Gregory Nazian. (*Orat. i. in Julian.*), and the excellent directions on the subject in St. Atha-

nasius (*Apol. de fuga sua*, p. 258–266; cp. à Lapide). The answer seems to be given in our Lord's words: 'The hireling fleeth because he is a hireling, and careth not for the sheep' (John x. 13). 'The good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep' (John x. 11). If a person has a flock committed to his care, and that flock will be scattered or torn by wolves, if he flies, then he must not fly."—Comp. Matt. xxiv. 15–20; Phil. i. 20–25; 2 Tim. iv. 6–8; Acts viii. 1; ix. 25; xiv. 6; xv. 38; 2 Cor. xi. 33; and Schaff's *History of the Christian Church*, vol. i., p. 179.—P. S.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

In how far flight in persecution is not only lawful, but duty.—When a Christian has to fly with his Master, he may likewise fly by himself.—Holy flight: 1. Its motive; 2. its conduct; 3. its aim.—All Christianity a flight, to the end of the world: 1. From city to city; 2. from country to country; 3. from world to world (from the old to the new).—Flight an act of faith: 1. An act of wisdom; 2. an act of sparing love; 3. an act of faithfulness; 4. an act of enduring hope.—The flight of the Church, its spread.—The flight of the fearful and that of the courageous.—When the disciples are expelled from a place, they are succeeded by the judgments of the Lord.—The witnesses of Christ shall never want new spheres of usefulness, if they leave at the right time such as have been closed to their labors.—Whether to stay or to go, must in every instance be learned from the Lord.—Whithersoever we go with the gospel, Christ will follow us.—The laborers of Christ shall neither want a field nor a blessing, till the Lord comes. [Similarly *Wordsworth:* the missionary work of the Church will not cease till the second coming of Christ. Comp. Matt. xxiv. 14.—P. S.]

---

8. *Christ has suffered Persecution before His disciples, and they only suffer along with Him.* **Second warning and comfort.** CH. X. 24, 25.

24 The [A] disciple is not above *his* [the] master, nor the [a] servant above his lord.
25 It is enough for the disciple that he be as his master, and the servant as his lord. If
they have called [surnamed][1] the master of the house Beelzebub [Beelzebul],[2] how
much more *shall they call*[3] them of his household?

[1] Ver. 25.—Ἐπεκάλεσεν, B., C., [Cod. Sinait.] Lachmann, Tischendorf, [Alford, Wordsworth. Meyer regards the ἐκάλεσεν of the Elzevir text as an arbitrary substitution of the more usual verb.—]

[2] Ver. 25.—[Βεελζεβούλ is the true reading, adopted by Tischendorf, Lachmann, Meyer, Alford, Wordsworth, Conant, Lange. The E. V. notes it in the margin. Comp. Exeg. Notes.—P. S.]

[3] Ver. 25.—[This interpolation is unnecessary.—]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 24. **The disciple is not**, etc.—A proverb. *See* the corresponding passages in rabbinical writings in Schöttgen.

Ver. 25. **This is enough for the disciple, in order that** (ἵνα) **he may be** (treated), etc.; *i. e.*, the subordination of the disciple to his teacher implies that he must share his fate. The same remark applies to the servant in reference to his lord. So Meyer, against the common explanation of the word ἵνα in this passage.

Βεελζεβούλ.—The Syrian Codd., the Itala, the Vulgate, and the Latin Fathers have Beelzebu*b*. This, then, may be regarded as the first explanation of the term—as equivalent to בַּעַל זְבוּב (2 Kings i. 2), the *fly-god*. The second explanation is furnished by Winer as follows: "By a Jewish pun, this name was, by the change of a letter, converted into בַּעַל זְבוּל (זִבְּלָא, Chaldee), *i. e.*, *dominus stercoris*, *lord of dung*, in a manner analogous to that in which Συχέμ was turned into Συχάρ. It is very natural that the later Jews, in their burning hatred of heathenism, transferred the name of a celebrated idol in their neighborhood on Satan." Accordingly, Lightfoot, Buxtorf, and most modern critics explain it as the name of Satan, being the prince of all impurity. A third interpretation renders זְבוּל by *habitation*, and Beelzebul by *dominus domicilii*. This means,—*a*. according to Gusset, Michaelis, and Meyer: lord of the kingdom of darkness, where the evil spirits dwell; *b*. according to Paulus: lord of Tartarus; *c*. according to Jahn: prince of the power of the air (Eph. ii. 2); according to Movers: Saturn as holding a castle in the seventh heaven.—With reference to the first interpretation, it is enough to say, that most of the readings are opposed to the form *Beelzebub*. It is evidently an exegetical explanation of the name Beelzebul from Beelzebub, the god of the Philistines, to whom the chasing away of flies was imputed.—Against the second explanation it is urged, that the word for *mud* or *dirt* is זֶבֶל, not זְבוּל. Winer, indeed, suggests that uncommon forms are occasionally used in a play upon words. Still, they must have some warrant in the use of the language. Besides, Meyer rightly calls attention to the fact, that the word Βεελζεβούλ bears reference to the expression οἰκοδεσπότης, which Christ had here chosen. Hence, "*lord of the habitation*."* Perhaps, then, this designation of Satan may refer to the habitation of demons in the possessed. The parallel passage in Matt. xii., where the Pharisees say (ver. 24): "This fellow doth not cast out devils but by Beelzebul, the prince of the devils," seems in favor of this view.

* [For this reason Alford, also, adopts Meyer's derivation, while Wordsworth adheres to Winer's interpretation: *dominus stercoris*.—P. S.]

The Lord Himself afterward characterizes the rule of the demons over the possessed under the biblical expression of "dwellers in a house" (vers. 25, 29; and especially ver. 45, "They enter in and *dwell* there"). If this be the correct interpretation of the term, it will also explain how it does not otherwise occur in Jewish writings. The enemies of the Lord charged Him with casting out devils through the prince of the devils, whom they in derision called Beelzebul (ix. 34; xii. 24). Jesus comments upon this in the following manner: The Pharisees designate as the prince of the devilish possession the Master of the house, who rightfully claims the heart of man as His dwelling (xii. 29), and casts out the usurper, who occasionally performed cures of demoniacs, for the purpose of blinding his victims. Hence the expression Beelzebul would refer only to the prince of devils who take possession of men on earth, not to the prince of evil spirits generally. Christ paraphrased the fact, that they stigmatized Him as acting under the inspiration of Beelzebul, by saying that He had been called Beelzebul because His enemies asserted that Satan had virtually devolved on Him the supremacy over demons. The expression is used in a sense similar to that in which the terms *Satan* and *Antichrist* occur in 2 Thess. ii. This may serve as a sufficient answer to those who ask, When the Jews had called Christ Beelzebul. Comp. xii. 24; John viii. 48. Similarly, it explains the inference drawn by the Lord: **How much more them of His household?** If the Jews had designated Christ as the prince of devils absolutely, that name could not have been applied to His household. But if they meant that He was the author and patron of demoniac possession, they might apply this even more boldly to His Apostles. Undoubtedly, however, the term bears also some reference to the god of the Philistines. Perhaps the connection may be traced in the following manner: As Beelzebul was supposed to banish, but also to bring, the plague of flies, so Jesus was accused of expelling demons, because He was the lord of their habitation.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

Christ, the Lord of the kingdom of heaven, who sends the Holy Ghost, the rightful Master of the human heart, is characterized by His enemies as prince of the kingdom of darkness, acting under the inspiration of Satan, the chief of the demons, or as Antichrist. Similarly, the disciples of Jesus cannot expect other than that their activity shall be characterized as demoniacal and antichristian.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

"The disciple is not above his Master:" this the watchword of Christ's faithful witnesses: 1. As to their conduct. They are subordinate in everything to Christ. 2. In their sufferings. Every true disciple must be willing to share the rejection of his Master.—"The disciple is not above his Master, nor the servant above his Lord:" this is sufficient comfort when misunderstood or misrepresented: 1. As a disciple, he feels that if the Master's work has been calumniated, he need expect no better; 2. as a servant, he feels that if the Lord of the house was stigmatized as a diabolical destroyer, he need not wonder if his service in the Church or to individuals is traduced.—It is a sad, yet an effectual, consolation to the witnesses of Christ when they are calumniated, that their Lord and Master was called Beelzebul.—Christ passes through the blasphemies of His enemies unharmed, as through a mist; let His people follow Him joyously.—Satan condemning himself even when he blasphemes. He must,—1. call that devilish which is divine; 2. he must represent as divine what is devilish.

Starke:—What comfort and honor, that Christ is the Master of the house, and His people its members!—*Cramer*: Ministers must, in the discharge of their office, have regard to God and the truth of the gospel, not to the threats of men.

Heubner:—The example of Christ is the most blessed encouragement.

---

9. *Holy boldness and candor the duty of the disciples, based on holy watchfulness, and on confidence in their safety, under the sovereign protection of God.* **Third and fourth warning and comfort.** CH. X. 26–31.

26 Fear them not therefore: for there is nothing covered [concealed, *verhüllt*], that
shall not be revealed [*enthüllt*]; and hid [*versteckt*], that shall not be known [*entdeckt*].
27 What I tell you in darkness, *that* speak ye in [the, τῷ] light: and what ye hear in the
28 ear, *that* preach ye upon the house-tops. And fear not [Be not afraid of, μὴ φοβεῖσθε
ἀπό][1] them which [that] kill[2] the body, but are not able to kill the soul:
But rather fear him [φοβεῖσθε τόν] which [who] is able to destroy both soul and
29 body in hell. Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing [penny][3]? and one of them
30 shall not [not one of them shall] fall on the ground without your Father. But the very
31 hairs of your head[4] are all numbered. Fear ye not therefore, ye are of more value
than many sparrows.

[1] Ver. 28.—[Lachmann and Tischendorf read: μὴ φοβεῖσθε ἀπό (imper. præs. pass.) *nolite timere, meture ab illa*, on the authority of Codd. B., C., (to which may be added Cod. Sinait., which reads twice, in vers. 28 and 31: φοβισθε, a mere writing error for φοβεῖσθε). But Cod. B. or Vaticanus, as published by Angelo Mai, reads: μὴ φοβηθῆτε ἀπό (conjunct. aor. i. pass.), and in the more correct edition of Buttmann, with different accentuation: μὴ φοβήθητε ἀπό (imperat. aor. i. pass.). So also Cod. Alexandrinus, as published by B. H. Cowper, Lond., 1860 (φοβηθῆτε), Origen, and,

of modern critics, Alford (φοβήθητε), Fritzsche and Conant (φοβηθῆτε). Meyer explains φοβηθῆτε from ver. 26 and reads also in ver. 31 φοβεῖσθε with B., D., L., Cod. Sinait., Lachmann, and Tischendorf. The main point for the sense, however, is the difference in the construction, the ἀπό after the first φοβεῖσθε and the acc. τόν after the second, concerning which the critical authorities are all agreed. In English this difference can be best reproduced by translating in the first case: *be not afraid of*, and in the other: *fear him*. *See* Exeg. Notes.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 28.—Ἀποκτεννόντων [double ν, also in Cod. Sinait.] is the Æolian-Alexandrian form [for ἀποκτεινόντων], Lachmann, [Tischendorf, Alford]. *See* the note of Meyer [Com. i., p. 227].

[3] Ver. 29.—[Luther and Lange render ἀσσάριον (diminut. from the Lat. *as*): *Pfennig*, de Wette: *Heller*. The E. V. uses *farthing* in ch. v. 26 for the Greek κοδράντης. But this is only the third or fourth part in value of an ἀσσάριον which is equal to a cent and a half of Am. money. Hence *penny* is more accurate. Conant: "The Saviour means by it the most trifling pecuniary value, or next to nothing; and to change the Common Version, merely for more minute exactness in such a case, would be mere pedantry. But as different words are used in the Greek, and as *farthing* and *penny* represent their exact relation and nearly their actual value, there is no harm in making the distinction."—P. S.]

[4] Ver. 30.—[The Greek and the German have here the advantage over the English in being able to place *your*, in marked contrast to the sparrows, at the beginning of the sentence. Ὑμῶν δὲ καὶ αἱ τρίχες τῆς κεφαλῆς, Lange (deviating from Luther): "*An euch aber sind auch die Haare des Hauptes*," etc. Perhaps we might render: "*But as to you, the very hairs of your head*," etc.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 26. **Fear them not therefore.**—Because every calumny of their faith was in the first place directed against their Master, who will set everything in its true light. Confidence in His παρουσία is to form the ground of their perfect παῤῥησία. All the wicked secrets of their opponents shall be brought to light; it would, therefore, be most unbecoming if they were to spread their faith, the most precious of all secrets, with timidity and by stealth,* as if it were some dangerous mystery.

For there is nothing covered, etc.—These two proverbial sayings or principles are apparently intended to supplement each other. The first of them refers probably to *the dealings of God*: He conceals and He reveals. The second refers to the *conduct of man* in connection with the dealings of God: men hide and conceal the truth, but it will be discovered, known, and acknowledged. The appearing of Christ will place everything in its proper light, Matt. xxv. 31; Eph. v. 13; 1 Cor. iv. 5.

Ver. 27. **What I tell you.**—This means to imply that the Lord recommended to His disciples to proceed more openly in their teaching than He had done. But this was the fundamental principle of the development of His revelation. His work was to be established in His disciples before it could be established in the world. Revelation had to receive its final completion in secret, among the despised community of the cross, before it could be presented in its fulness to the world.—**Upon the house-tops.**—The roofs were flat, so that it was possible to converse, in a loud voice, from one house-top to another, or into the street. A figurative expression for the most public declaration.

Ver. 28. **Fear not them that kill the body.**†—This παῤῥησία may indeed occasion their death. But they should neither fear death nor those who kill. They kill only the body. In other words, the hope of the great appearing of Christ, which shall make everything manifest, must raise them also above the grave.

Both soul and body.—In my *Life of Jesus* (ii. 2, p. 721), I have with Stier applied this to Satan, while most commentators refer it to God. The former interpretation I supported on the following grounds: 1. Because the *same kind* of fear which is felt toward those who kill the body cannot be cherished in reference to God. But here I overlooked that the expression used in the one case is φοβεῖσθε ἀπό, [comp. the Hebr. יָרֵא מִן], and in the other, φοβήθητε [φοβεῖσθε] τόν. The word φοβεῖν may also be used in reference to proper fear, and the use of the Aorist (implying the continuation of a fear already cherished), as also the accusative instead of ἀπό, are in favor of this view. 2. Because the idea of destruction of body and soul seems rather to apply to Satan. But the great enemy does not destroy soul and body *in* hell (ἐν γεέννῃ),* where he and condemned souls are punished (Matt. xxv. 41; Rev. xx. 10), but *before* that time, and for the purpose of having them consigned *to* hell. The judgment of Gehenna is not administered by Satan. 3. Because of the expression ἀπόλλυμι, which in other places refers to noxious destruction, or to laying waste, and the name of Ἀπολλύων, "who dwells in the place of destruction." However, the text does not bear, "Fear the destroyer," but, "Fear Him who is *able* to destroy," which could only refer to God. Finally, from the parallel passage in Luke xii. 5, "Fear Him who hath power to cast into hell," we at once conclude that this fear can only apply to the Almighty. Satan works that sinful fear of death which is the bondage from which we can only be delivered by a higher and holier fear—that of God (Heb. ii. 14).

[This change of Dr. Lange, which supersedes the protest of Meyer *in loc.* (4th ed., vol. i., p. 239), is decidedly for the better. The Scripture nowhere uses the phrase φοβεῖσθαι τὸν διάβολον, nor does it ever ascribe to Satan such power of destruction; while, on the contrary, φοβεῖσθαι is usually followed by τὸν θεόν, and God is represented throughout as the Almighty dispenser of life and death, both temporal and eternal. Bengel aptly quotes James iv. 12, which is decisive against Stier: "There is one lawgiver who is able (ὁ δυνάμενος) to save and to destroy" (ἀπολέσαι, the same words as in our passage). Christ sets God before us here as the sole object both of our godly, child-like *fear*, and (in vers. 29–31) of our child-like *trust*. We should fear Him alone because of His power to destroy, and should trust Him alone because of His power to save and His ever-watchful care of His children. *See* Dr. Alford's remarks against Stier, and also the note of Dr. Owen *in loc.*: "*Fear Him* (*i. e.*, God), not as before, *fear from Him*, because reverence and awe, such as is due from man to his Maker, is intended, and not the fear or terror which human cruelty can inspire."—P. S.]

* [In German: *mit ängstlicher Heimlichthuerei*.—]

† [These were the dying words of Ulrich Zwingli on the battle field of Cappel in Switzerland, Oct., 1531.—P. S.]

* [Luther wrongly translates: *in die* Hölle, for *in der*, mistaking ἐν for εἰς. The E. V. here, as elsewhere, is more accurate.—P. S.]

Ver. 29. **Two sparrows.**—The word στρουθία properly signifies little birds generally [aviculi]; here, in the more definite sense, *little sparrows* [*passerculi*].—**Farthing,** *penny,* ἀσσάριον, the tenth part of a drachm, or a Roman denar, afterward valued still lower; indicating the smallest coin.—**Not one of them shall fall to the ground.**—To portray sudden death, the bird falling to the ground, struck by a stone or an arrow. Irenæus and Chrysostom refer it to the snare of the bird-catcher; but this would scarcely be so applicable.

Ver. 30. **But the very hairs.**—Indicating the most special providence (*providentia specialissima*), and the most absolute preservation. The hair as the natural ornament of the head. No part of our life, of what characterizes or adorns it, shall be lost.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The disciples must bear in mind that the gospel of Jesus is destined to become a revelation for all nations. They are to form a Church, and not a secret society, or party, or school, or political fraternity. The contrast between the secrecy which the Lord employed in teaching them, and the publicity with which they were to come forward, indicates the law according to which revelation was ever to develop and break forth more clearly and openly, and points far beyond the mission then entrusted to them.

2. *They which kill the body.*—(1) Psychology: body and soul; (2) doctrine of immortality; (3) eschatology: the kingdom of Christ belongs pre-eminently to the other world, beyond death and the grave. Mark also the contrast between *killing* the body and *destroying* body and soul. The soul cannot be annihilated. Lastly, it also implies the doctrine of the resurrection of the body. The bodies of the lost shall suffer with their souls in hell.*

3. Not a hair of your head shall perish without your Father, far less your head itself.—An expression implying their complete safety.—"Of more value than many sparrows." This depends upon the διαφέρειν, and is intended to indicate the infinite superiority of the disciples over irrational creatures. The climax is as follows:—The humblest of God's creatures have their value in His sight: how much more human beings! Especially Christians: but, above all, the witnesses of Jesus. The value of the life of Jesus is the height of the climax, but does not appear here.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The address of the Lord to His people: *Fear not.* 1. The fear from which we are delivered (of revilers and of murderers, of the loss of honor and of life); 2. the fear by which we are delivered (*Fear Him who is able,* etc.); 3. the spiritual grounds for being fearless (confidence in the great revelation of Christ, consciousness of our immortality and of our complete safety in the hands of God); the blessed effect of such fearlessness—perfect joy in bearing witness for Jesus (or in particular cases, triumph of life over death, entrance into glory).—With the manifestation of Christ's righteousness, everything else must become manifest.—When God makes known what is hid, men can no longer succeed in concealing it.—The impending great revelation in its twofold effects: 1. As giving perfect comfort to the disciples: 2. as the greatest terror to an evil conscience.—Holy and spiritual fear will set us free from all carnal fear.—A right sense of our immortality consists in the feeling that we are perfectly safe in the keeping of our Father.—The price of articles in the market an emblem of the high price which God attaches to life.—Money, or the price which men attach, a symbol of the value which God sets.—"*Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing?*" or, the birds of the air a sermon to us, both in death and in life.—God cares for all living, after its own kind: 1. According to its life (the Living One cares for the living, the God of providence for every individual, the sympathizing Saviour pities every one); 2. according to its peculiar *mode of life* (for His creatures in His goodness, for persons in His love, for believers in His grace); 3. according to the *object of their lives* (Christ, for His own sake and for that of His people; Christians, for Christ's and their own sakes; and all creatures, for the sake of Christians and of the kingdom of God).—"*The very hairs of your head are all numbered;*" or, the complete safety of Christians in the keeping of their Father: 1. Their whole life, with all that characterizes and adorns it, is safe; 2. they lose their earthly life, only to gain a higher; 3. their life, with all its gain, is bestowed on them by their Father in heaven.

Starke:—Those who fear to proclaim the whole truth are false teachers, and neither cold nor hot.—*Quesnel:* It is sinful to withhold the word of God from the common people. [Quesnel adds on ver. 27: "The Church has no more hidden mysteries, nor secret truths; and it is now the time to reveal all the knowledge and grace which Christ has committed to her. It is to injure religion, to imagine that it contains some truths or mysteries which ought to be concealed."—P. S.]—*Cramer:* Human fear must be overcome by the fear of God.—Eternal death is the only evil which really deserves to be feared.—*Quesnel:* It is a sign of great blindness to allow our souls to be destroyed.—The contemplation of the providence of God a powerful means for overcoming the fear of man.—What infinite value attaches to a soul for which Jesus has shed his blood! [We add from Quesnel on ver. 28: "It is prudence to deliver up the body in order to save the soul. This is to cast the lading of the vessel into the sea, to preserve the men from destruction. A man loses nothing when he loses that only which must perish."—P. S.]

Heubner:—Nothing in the life of His people is of small importance before God.—Infinite value of an immortal soul.

* [We add the remark of Dr. Brown: "*both soul and body in hell.* A decisive proof this that there is a hell for the body as well as the soul in the eternal world; in other words, that the torment that awaits the lost will have elements of suffering adapted to the *material* as well as the spiritual part of our nature, both of which, we are assured, will exist for ever."—P. S.]

10. *Confession and Denial; history of the kingdom of God, and judgment of the world.* **Fifth warning and comfort.** CH. X. 32, 33.

32 Whosoever therefore [Every one, therefore, who][1] shall confess me before men,
him will I confess also [also confess, κἀγώ] before my Father which [who] is in heaven
33 [in the heavens].[2] But whosoever [whoever] shall deny me before men, him will I
also deny before my Father which [who] is in heaven [in the heavens].

[1] Ver. 32.—[Πᾶς οὖν ὅστις, Lange: *Jeder nun, der;* while in ver. 33 we have simply ὅστις, without πᾶς.—P. S.
[2] Ver. 32.—Ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς both here and in ver. 33.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 32. **Every one, therefore, who shall confess [acknowledge] Me**; ὁμολογήσει ἐν ἐμοί,—literally: confess *in Me.** "This corresponds with the idea of ἐν Χριστῷ εἶναι." So also in Luke xii. 8. [The ἐν is not equivalent to *in behalf of Me*, as Owen explains, but it shows the ground or root of the confession, namely, a living union with Christ. He does not mean a mere outward confession of the mouth, but a genuine and consistent confession of the whole life. "He will not confess the confessing Judas, nor deny the denying Peter," because the confession of the former was hypocritical, the denial of the latter a transient weakness, followed immediately by the deepest repentance.—P. S.]

[**Him will I also confess, . . him will I also deny,** etc.—It is worthy of notice, as Alford suggests, that both here and in the Sermon on the Mount, vii. 21–23, the Saviour, *after mention of the Father*, describes *Himself* as the Judge and Arbiter of eternal life and death.—P. S.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. Every genuine and earnest *testimony* for Christ is a *confession*, while every unchristian deed is a *denial*. "The world, in its indifference and hesitation between heaven and hell—or, rather, in its antagonism to God, under the pretence of morality—condemns only two things: secular crimes and heavenly virtues, or the manifestations of faith; nay, the latter incur its special ire, as it considers them the worst of crimes. Hence our testimony for Christ must always be in face of the opposition of the world, which readily seizes upon it and treats it as a crime; thus converting our profession into a confession." Let it, however, be also remembered, that every genuine confession is not merely concerning Christ, but *in Christ*—concerning all revelation, and concerning the new state of matters which this revelation is designed to inaugurate.

2. This confession of Christ on the part of His people indicates the contrast between the import of the judgment of the world and the cause of Christ. On the other hand, the confession of His people on the part of Christ before the Father, marks the contrast between the humble estate of Christians here, and the glory to which they are called. In both instances, the contrast is infinite; but it is the faith of His people on the one hand, and the love of the Saviour on the other, which influences the confession.—Again: Denial on the part of Christ, implies denial of the kingdom of heaven, of love, and of life. Accordingly, this virtually implies the judgment. Substantially, it is equivalent to the verdict, "I never knew you," Matt. vii. 23; only with increased intensity, since it applies to His messengers and witnesses, who were specially commissioned to make confession of Him. Any Christian element in such persons shall be utterly ignored, since it had not led to that true confession which is the victory over the world. They are unregenerate, and hence remain unacknowledged.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The glorious presence of God in Christ, the ground on which Christians are called to make confession: 1. It is a revelation which brings everything to light, and hence fills the Christian with joy in the word; 2. by it the whole life of believers is preserved and completed; accordingly, they are also encouraged wholly to own Jesus.—The kingdom of God and the Christian life as summed up in the word *confessing:* 1. Our course here may be summed up as either a confession or a denial of Christ; 2. so also the judgment to come,—it is either a confession or a denial on the part of Christ.—As Christ is to us before men, so shall we be to Him before His Father in heaven. —Unutterable cowardice and vileness of the man who attaches greater value to the judgment of men than to that of our Father in heaven.—A genuine confession is a confession both *in* the Lord and *of* the Lord. —A genuine confession must be in accordance with what we confess: 1. It is an outward manifestation which must also increasingly appear in the life; 2. it is a life which ever proves a manifestation of the faithfulness of God.—The administration of God will be sealed and confirmed by this, that Christ shall confess His own before His Father.—The great promise attaching to Christian faithfulness.

Starke:—Christ is not only denied with the lips, but also by an ungodly life.—*Zeisius:* Woe to all apostates.

Heubner:—The judgment of Christ alone is decisive.

[*Quesnel:*—To confess Jesus Christ is to follow His precept and example; to suffer for His sake; to love, teach, and practise His doctrine.—We refer this great truth to the times of the martyrs, because we will not ourselves be martyrs for the truth. It belongs to all times and all believers, every one in his proper way.—To appear before the tribunal of God without having Christ for our Advocate, and, on the contrary, to have Him there as a witness and a judge, how can we think of it and not expire with horror!* —P. S.]

* [De Wette and Alford: A Hebraistic or rather Syriac mode of expression for, shall make Me the object of his acknowledgment among and before men.—P. S.]

* [Dr. Adam Clarke (Com. on Matt. x. 33) appropriates the last sentence from Quesnel literally, without any acknowledgment.]

11. *Christ come to send into the old world, not peace, but a sword, because He sends, in His love, absolute peace and eternal life.* **Sixth warning and comfort.** CH. X. 34–39.

34 Think not that I am come to send [to throw, βαλεῖν] peace on [the old] earth: I
35 came not to send peace, but a sword. For I am come to set a man at variance against
[with] his father, and the [a] daughter against [with] her mother, and the daughter-in-
36 law [a bride, νύμφην] against [with] her mother-in-law. And a man's foes *shall be*
37 they of his own household. He that loveth father or mother more than me is not
worthy of me: and he that loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me.
38 And he that taketh not his cross, and followeth after me, is not worthy of me.
39 He that findeth [hath found or gained, εὑρών] his life [ψυχήν] shall lose it: and[1] he
that loseth [hath lost, ἀπολέσας, *i. e.*, sacrificed for Christ] his life for my sake shall
find it.

[1] Ver. 39.—[Cod. Sinait. omits the clause: ὁ εὑρὼν . . αὐτὴν, καί; but it is sustained by all other authorities.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 34. **I came not to send peace.**—How does this agree with the angelic hymn, Luke ii. 14? Meyer: "This is not merely a rhetorical expression, but Jesus really states an *object*, although not the *final object*, of His advent; since He clearly foresaw the hostile opposition as an unavoidable *transition* from the old to the new state of things, which, in the execution of His Messianic office, He must therefore have willed." So far well; but the expression itself must have rendered any misunderstanding impossible. Hence βαλεῖν is so chosen, that it does not apply merely to μάχαιραν. Wetstein erroneously regards it as equivalent to sowing. It evidently implies sudden action; probably also throwing, casting. It therefore accords with the expression ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν, and implies something quite different from the angelic song, ἐπὶ γῆς εἰρήνη.* Luke (xii. 51) uses the expression δοῦναι ἐν τῇ γῇ, and accordingly does not employ the word βάλλειν, which, however, occurs in ver. 49: πῦρ ἦλθον βαλεῖν εἰς τὴν γῆν. By the term "*earth*," we are to understand the ancient and established theocratic and political order of things, John iii. 31; Rev. xiii. 11. To it Christ could not bring peace, but the sword, *i. e.*, a contest for life and death, in order to establish His kingdom of peace. The kingdom of God on earth can only be established by the destruction of the sinful principles of the old man, the old world, and the old earth.

Ver. 35. **For I am come.**—Not a mere repetition of ver. 21, but the reverse of the picture there given. The terms, διχάσαι κατά, indicate a direct influence from the Lord; hence, the son, the daughter, and the daughter-in-law, are here the representatives of Christ. It has not inaptly been suggested, that these special terms have been selected, because the younger members and the female portion of households were commonly the first to embrace the gospel. There is also an evident reference here to Micah vii. 6, although in a modified and free manner. Stier calls attention to the fact, that according to the predictions of Micah, war and the sorrows of the daughter of Zion were to usher in the kingdom of peace. "The best and most precious peace on earth, as well as the ground of every other, is domestic peace and family concord. But so long as it rests on a false foundation, it must be broken up by the introduction of the peace of Christ." For kindred rabbinical sayings, *see* Meyer and Schöttgen, p. 105.

Ver. 37. [**He that loveth,** etc.—Our Lord claims here a love stronger than the dearest natural attachments, a love and devotion as is due only to a truly Divine being. This is one of those extraordinary claims which in Him, the God-Man, are perfectly easy, natural, and irresistible, while in others they would be extreme madness or intolerable presumption.—P. S.]

Ver. 38. **He that does not take his cross,** λαμβάνει,—freely; referring to the Roman custom, by which the *cruciarii* were obliged to carry their cross (xxvii. 32). A prophetic reference to the death of Christ; no doubt purposely chosen, in order to prepare the disciples for that fearful prospect. That the Lord anticipated this consummation at an early period, appears from John iii. 14. [**His** *cross*, as I shall carry *My* cross.]

Ver. 39. **He that hath found his life.**—De Wette: "ψυχή means here, in alternate clauses, the life of the body and eternal life, or the salvation of the soul." He that gains, or saves, his earthly life, preserving it by unfaithfulness, shall lose the life of his life. But he that loses it by faithfulness, shall find eternal life. At the same time we must remember that the Lord only speaks of one true kind of life. Hence, the finding or preserving of life in the first case, and the loss of it in the second, are only in appearance. Lastly, it seems to us quite incompatible to suppose, with Meyer, that this eternal life shall only be enjoyed at the second coming of Christ, or at the resurrection of the dead.*

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. "These verses contain a cycle of ideas which had never before been uttered by mortal. All the

* [In the same chapter of Luke, where the *Gloria in excelsis* occurs, we are told, that Christ was set for the fall as well as the rising of many, ii. 34. His Gospel is a savor of death unto death to unbelievers, as it is a savor of life unto life to believers, 2 Cor. ii. 16.—P. S.]

* [So also Alford: "The first ψυχή is the *life of this world*, which we here all count so dear to us; the *second*, implied in αὐτήν, the *real life of man* in a blessed eternity." But the contrast is not between this present life and the life to come (comp. the past participles: εὑρών and ἀπολέσας, who *has found*, who *has lost*, not: who *findeth*, who *loseth*); but between the outward, earthly, secular life, with all its pleasures, comforts, and the inward, spiritual eternal life, which *commences* already *here* in faith, that will be perfected in heaven.—P. S.]

former prophetic expectations concerning the kingdom of God are here presented to our view as supersensuous, future, and heavenly,—quite in accordance with the deeper sense of the predictions of inspired seers, yet never before expressed in a manner so clear and decided. This, then, is the great barrier cast by the Lord in the way of all who would construct the kingdom of peace in this world from worldly elements,—beginning with the Jews, whose folly is here exposed, and ending with the thoughtless builders of the last time." Stier.

2. The Lord makes an onslaught upon the corruptions of the world with the holy sword of His word, allowing the world to employ the sword of persecution against Himself and His people. Comp. Jer. viii. 11; vi. 14; Micah iii. 5, 11; Ezek. xiii. 10, 16; 1 Pet. iv. 4. This passage may also serve to throw light on the charge brought against Protestantism, as if it had served to divide nations, and led to civil wars. [The civil wars in France, the thirty years' war in Germany, the civil war in England.]

3. The Lord makes on this occasion the first allusion to His death on the cross. A masterly preparation of His disciples. Crucifixion was the worst kind of punishment then known; hence the phrase, *to take his cross*, signifies the voluntary readiness to suffer the utmost in this world for Christ. Indirectly, Christ presented Himself already here as the first bearer of the cross (*follow after Me*).

4. The declaration of the Saviour, that he that will save his life shall lose it, etc., holds true both historically and spiritually. That species of egotism which ever seeks to preserve its life, and constantly aims after its own, shall find death; while faith, with its devotion and self-sacrifice, is crowned by life. Compare the mystic work: *Theologia Germanica*, of the middle ages, which follows out this idea.*

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Dangerous delusion, as if Christ had brought a delusive peace to the delusions of the old order of things. 1. Character of this delusion,—*a. historically:* the ancient and more recent chiliastic views, as appearing in ecclesiastical and sectarian tendencies; *b. dogmatically:* it springs from an overestimate of the old order of things, from an underestimate of the Spirit of Christ, and from a false estimate of what is external, compared with what is internal. 2. Its pernicious effects. We lose Christ, the true Prince of Peace, to follow the standard of a false messiah. We lose true peace, and, with it, the prospect of that kingdom of peace which is yet to cover the whole world. Lastly, we surrender our hope in the great and glorious appearance of the Lord of peace.—The world in its unregenerate state is just like the old garment, upon which it were folly to put the new cloth of Christ's peace.—The lost estate of the world appears most distinctly in the false peace which it cherishes.—Christ sends a sword in order to send peace.—The sword of Christ, and the sword of the world; or, *suffering on the cross*, and *affixing to the cross*.—The family as the basis of every spiritual movement: 1. The basis of the kingdom of peace; 2. the battle-field of the spirit of peace; 3. the first manifestation of the kingdom of peace, or of the Church.—Christ's warfare infinitely preferable to the peace of the world. 1. The peace of the world ends with* the eternal rebellion and warfare of hell; 2. the warfare of Christ ushers in the eternal kingdom of heavenly peace.—The sword of the Lord is true peace: 1. It proceeds from His peace; 2. it is wielded in the service of His peace; 3. it leads to His peace. —The claims of Christ are identical with those of God Himself (Ex. xx.).—The love of Christ in its relation to the love of the family. 1. Its *value:* (*a*) It is higher than family love; (*b*) it may even come into conflict with the latter, for, (*c*) Christ sticketh closer than a brother; (*d*) His love forms the basis of true family love; (*e*) it gives an eternal and spiritual character to the love of the family. 2. Its *claims:* "He that loveth father or mother," etc., is not worthy of Christ; for, (*a*) he betrays the highest love; (*b*) he does not properly love even his own; (*c*) he is lost to true love which gives to man his real value. —Enlarged view. The love of Christ far above all earthly love.—The love of Christ may well claim from us the surrender of those we love, and of our own life also! 1. Explanation of this statement; 2. demonstration of it.—Spurious affection for our own, is in reality only disguised self-love.—Relation between the fifth and the first commandment: 1. The former is subordinate to the latter, because, 2. it springs from it, and 3. it is fulfilled in it.—The first utterance of the Lord concerning His cross was when He summoned His disciples to share it with Him.—"He that findeth his life:" 1. The historical motto of Christianity; 2. the motto of the inner life; 3. the motto of every relationship of life, of every possession, enjoyment, or claim.

Starke:—The blame rests not with Christ, the Prince of Peace, Isa. ix. 6; nor with the gospel, Eph. vi. 15; but with the malice of man.—*Zeisius:* Christ the Wonderful; Prince of Peace, yet disturber of peace.—Satan and his children the real cause of all disturbances in the world.—*Quesnel:* Our nearest friends oftentimes the greatest enemies of our salvation.—Natural affection is proper in its own place, but it must not occupy the first rank.—Ever let us assign to God the highest place, as the first commandment enjoins. *Amandus est genitor, sed præponendus est creator* (*Augustine*).—*Christo nihil præponere debemus, quoniam et ille nihil nobis præposuit* (*Cyprian*).—To deny what is earthly, forms a great part in the divine life.—We cannot love Christ if we cherish the love of the world.—Our closest relationships often lead aside from the highest good; hence they must be abnegated.—Every Christian must bear the cross.—To love oneself inordinately, is in reality to hate oneself.—Loss for the sake of Christ is true gain.—Death for the sake of Christ is true life.

Heubner:—Christianity a declaration of war to the world, and yet a message of peace for the world. —Surrender of natural ties.—What does Christ offer in their stead? Heavenly, spiritual, and eternal connections.—How much of natural affection has been sacrificed upon the altar of Christ [but in this case, sacrificing is not surrendering, but sanctifying and giving up to God]!—Christ has displayed the greatest love toward us (1 John iv. 19).—To shepherds: Do you love the flock of Christ more than your own house? Deut. xxxiii. 9, 10.—False application of this declaration by monasticism.—No cross, no crown.— Without Christ, no true happiness.—Nothing is lost that is surrendered for Christ.

* [An English translation by Miss C. Winkworth with Introductions by the late Chevalier Bunsen, and Charles Kingsley, republished at Andover.—P. S.]

* [Not: "*springs from*," as the Edinb. trl. reverses the German: "*geht aus in den* (not: *von dem*) ewigen Aufruhr und Krieg der Hölle."—P. S.]

12. *Along with the cross of Christ, His servants bring, not misery, but the highest happiness into the world. They who receive them, receive Christ and God Himself, and their reward is from Him, is God Himself.* **Seventh warning and comfort.** CH. X. 40–42.

40 He that receiveth you receiveth me; and he that receiveth me receiveth him that
41 sent me. He that receiveth a prophet in the name of a prophet shall receive a pro-
phet's reward; and he that receiveth a righteous man in the name of a righteous man
42 shall receive a righteous man's reward. And whosoever shall give to drink unto one
of theso little ones[1] a cup of cold *water*[2] only in the name of a disciple, verily I say
unto you, he shall in no wise lose his reward.

[1] Ver. 42.—[Cod. D., etc., read: *τῶν ἐλαχίστων* for *τῶν μικρῶν*.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 42.—[Cod. D., Origen, and some later MSS. add *ὕδατος*, *water*, after *ψυχροῦ*, *cold*.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 40. **He that receiveth you.**—Such is the general principle. The explanation of de Wette—"your cause is Mine, and the cause of God"—does not exhaust its import. It implies, not merely that the disciples shall find welcome and succor, but also, that the cross which they bring with them shall be the well-spring of infinite blessing.—This principle also embodies the two great features of salvation—it is to receive Christ and to receive God. [Alford: "*δέχεται* has here the wider sense of not only receiving to house and board, but receiving in heart and life the *message* of which the Apostles were the bearers. *See* John xx. 21."—P. S.]

Ver. 41. **He that receiveth a prophet.**—The special application and inference from the principle. —**In the name.** In rabbinical writings, לְשֵׁם. Meyer: "With reference to that which the name implies. [Alford: "*εἰς ὄνομα*, a Hebraism (לְשֵׁם): *because he is*, *i. e.*, for the love of Christ, whose prophet he is. The sense is: He who by receiving a prophet because he is a prophet, or a holy man because he is a holy man, recognizes, enters into, these states as appointed by Me, shall receive the blessedness of these states, shall derive all the spiritual benefits which these states bring with them, and share their everlasting reward."—Wordsworth: "*εἰς ὄνομα* is more forcible than *ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι*. It signifies an inward movement of *love to*, and, as it were, identification with the prophet, and consequently a reception of his message into the soul. He who receives a minister of Christ, *because* he is *such*, and with love and adhesion to *Christ*, the True Prophet (as distinguished from *men*, who are only His instruments), shall partake in the reward promised to those 'who turn many to righteousness' (Dan. xii. 3). The prophet to be received may be an unworthy person—a Judas. Our Lord, foreseeing this, says that the *office* is to be regarded, and not the *person*; and that you will not lose your reward if you receive a prophet, though he who is received is unworthy. Receive him in the *name of a prophet*, not for the sake of any secular pre-eminence or any worldly consideration, but because he is a prophet, and you will receive a prophet's reward."—P. S.]—**A prophet's reward**;—De Wette: Such as a prophet receives, not such as he gives (Paulus).

A righteous man; *i. e.*, one who embodies prophecy in his faith and life. Evidently alluding to the righteousness of faith in Christ.

Ver. 42. **Unto one of these little [lowly] ones.**—With reference to the disciples. Fritzsche suggests that they are so called, because the Rabbins designated their disciples as קְטַנִּים.* Meyer sees in it an allusion to their future low and despised condition. In our view, the expression refers on the one hand to the contrast between the disciples and Christ their Master, and to that between their low position in the world and their high place in the kingdom of heaven.—**A cup of cold water**; *i. e.*, the smallest favor, the least act of Christian charity.—**His reward**;—*i. e.*, the reward meet and due to him.

On the result, and the work achieved by the Apostles, comp. Mark vi. 12, 13; Luke ix. 6.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The principle, "He that receiveth you," etc., is closely connected with the fundamental principle of Christ's own mission into the world, John xx. 21. He was sent by the Father, and He in turn sends His Apostles. Accordingly, they who receive His Apostles, receive Him; and they who receive Him, receive God. "This not merely implies: it shall be considered as if he had received, etc.; but, that Christ really comes to us in and by His servants. 'I in them, and Thou in Me,' John xvii. 23." Gerlach.

2. This principle is in perfect accordance with the fundamental relations of spiritual life. By means of spiritual susceptibility, man comes to share and enjoy spiritual fellowship, and thus both blessing and blessedness; or, the reward of him who communicates spiritual blessings. Receptive spirits enter into spiritual fellowship and enjoy spiritual community with productive spirits; believers through the Apostles with Christ and God.

3. Even in the Sermon on the Mount, persecution for righteousness' sake had been declared identical with persecution for Christ's sake. Here also the term "righteous" evidently points to the righteousness of Christ, and that all the more distinctly, that even in a historical sense, Christ, as the Righteous

* [But such a Rabbinical phrase is doubtful. In the passage quoted by Wetstein קְטַנִּים means *parvuli*, *i. e.*, *children*. *See* Meyer *in loc.*, p. 241. Still the word might easily have assumed this meaning as distinguished from רַב, *great, a master*. Alford is disposed to take *μικροί* literally of some *children* who may have been present (xviii. 2–6); but *τούτων* is evidently to be taken *δεικτικῶς* as pointing to the disciples present.—P. S.]

One, formed the connecting link between the prophets and the Apostles.—Lastly, this promise implies a corresponding warning of impending judgment in case of resistance.

4. Extent and conditions of the authority of the Apostles.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The witnesses of Christ must not be afraid of the detrimental consequences which the message of peace brings, so far as this world is concerned.—A Christian may well invite others to share the cross, since he invites them to share the crown.—Blessed misery which Christianity causes in the world.—"He that receiveth you," etc.; or, the apostolic authority: 1. What important conditions attach to it; 2. how these conditions constitute its greatness.—How the greatness of Christ's servants appears and disappears: 1. It appears in their being ambassadors of the Spirit of Christ and of God; 2. it disappears before the Spirit, the Saviour, and the Father, whom they bring to those who receive them.—Susceptibility, or trustfulness, the bond of spiritual fellowship and spiritual communication between heaven and earth.—Those who are susceptible obtain the reward of Heaven's messengers whom they receive, and that in ascending line: 1. The reward of a prophet; 2. the reward of a righteous man; 3. the fullest reward of a righteous man in the reward of all the Apostles.—Faith in the Righteous One: the righteousness of faith.—Even the smallest service of love may obtain the richest reward, if, in doing it to the Lord's people, we devote it to the Lord Himself.—If it is intended as evidence of our having received the Lord.

Starke:—Luke x. 16; John xiii. 20.—*Cramer*:—He that receives the servants of God, receives God Himself into his house.—The more lowly in outward appearance the messenger who is received, the greater the faith which sees Christ in him, and looks only to the Lord. Matt. xxv. 31.—*Osiander*:—It shall be well both in time and eternity with him who promotes the Christian ministry and schools, and who does good to believers.

[*Quesnel* on ver. 42:—Charity heightens the smallest actions. It is this which recommends good works.—Under a just and merciful God, no sin is unpunished, no good action is unrewarded.—Jesus Christ confirms this last promise with the solemn *Verily*, to stimulate us to acts of charity, and to destroy all doubt as to the reward.—In the world, great services only receive great reward; in the kingdom of God, the smallest acts of kindness to the humblest persons may justly hope for a very great reward.—P. S.]

Heubner:—The spirit of faith and of love transforms every work, and surrounds even the meanest with a halo of glory.—God leaves not the smallest deed of love unrewarded.

General survey of the whole chapter.—Homily on the apostolic mission of the disciples of Jesus: *a.* Their mission, and their preparation for it by the Lord; *b.* the goal, and the order of their journey; *c.* their freedom from care, and their sustenance; *d.* their stay, and their further progress; *e.* their sufferings; *f.* their encouragements and consolations.—Lectures on smaller portions: The Apostles and their mission (vers. 1–10).—The world in its bearing toward the Apostles (vers. 11–22).—Admonitions and consolations of the Lord, to stir us up to faithfulness in our work of bearing witness to the Christian faith (vers. 23–42).

B. CHRIST MANIFESTING HIMSELF AS THE KING, BY CLEARLY BRINGING OUT THE FACT, THAT HE HAS NOT BEEN OWNED AS PROPHET, AND BY MANIFESTING HIS ROYAL DIGNITY. COMMENCEMENT OF THE GREAT CONFLICT BETWEEN CHRIST AND THE OLD THEOCRATIC WORLD, PREFIGURED BY THE DIFFICULTIES EXPERIENCED BY THE BAPTIST, AND BEGINNING WITH THE UNBELIEF MANIFESTED IN THE CITIES OF GALILEE.

CHAPTER XI.

(*The Gospel for the 3d Sunday in Advent:* XI. 2–10.—Parallels: Luke vii. 18–35; x. 13–15, 21, 22.)

CONTENTS:—While Christ's blessed activity was bearing richest fruits, and during the course of His third journey, when passing along the shores of the Lake of Galilee, where His advent had been announced and prepared by His twelve Apostles, the great conflict between Him and the old secularized theocracy commenced. Hitherto the attacks of the Pharisees and scribes on the Lord had been at least isolated. But now commenced a series of contradictions, springing from opposition avowed, and on principle, and incited by the chiefs of the party at Jerusalem. The contest opens with the serious circumstance, that even John, the Baptist and forerunner of the Lord, seems for a moment in danger of being offended at Him. Christ feels, however, so certain of His victory over John, that immediately after replying to his inquiry, He publicly claims him as His associate and precursor. All the more, therefore, does He lay it to the charge of His cotemporaries, that they had disbelieved both John and Himself. The hopeless captivity of John was sufficient evidence that the people had given him up: while the unbelief of the cities of Galilee formed a plain indication that they were also ready to surrender the Lord. It is characteristic of

the systematic method of Matthew, that he records on this occasion the sentence of condemnation pronounced by the Lord upon these cities, which, in the actual course of events, was uttered at a later period, when Christ finally left Galilee. But this unbelief and opposition evoke, in all its depth and fulness, Christ's consciousness of His royal dignity, as it appears in the concluding sentences of this chapter. In ch. xii. this conflict appears as one of principle,—the Pharisees meeting the Lord with the charge, that His disciples, and He Himself, broke the sabbath, and obliging Him to withdraw from their machinations against His life. At last, they come publicly forward with the accusation, which they had before spread in secret, that the Lord practised magic, was in league with Satan, and cast out devils by the prince of the devils. This daring accusation obliged the Lord publicly to rebuke and to warn them of blasphemy against the Holy Ghost. In return, they insist on some sign from heaven to verify His *Messianic claims*, which His disciples had published as a secret. The Lord Jesus points them to the token from the deep, the sign of the prophet Jonas—the type of His death on the cross, and to the impending judgment of becoming subject to the sway of demons, which awaited them after His decease. The opposition to Jesus was now so great and general, that even His mother and His brethren were, in their mistaken kindness, offended at Him, and attempted to withdraw Him from His enemies under a pretext,—a circumstance to which the Evangelist faintly alludes. In this context, the Evangelist records the seven parables concerning the kingdom of heaven (ch. xiii.), some of which had, however, been uttered at a former period. These parables also indicate the altered position of the Lord with reference to the people. He now requires to instruct them by parables in the kingdom of heaven. The offences still continue and increase. At the close of these parables, the Evangelist records, that the Lord was rejected even by His own city,—a circumstance which had occurred at an earlier period. Jesus then withdraws (though, chronologically, at an earlier period, see ch. xii.) from Herod Antipas, the ruler of Galilee, who had shortly before ordered the execution of John the Baptist, and betakes Himself to the eastern shore of the sea (ch. xiv.), where He spreads a table for the multitudes. On several subsequent occasions, He teaches on the western shore; the last two times to be opposed by the Pharisees, chs. xv. and xvi. Only in passing, and preparatory to His journey to Jerusalem, does He again visit His own country (ch. xvii. 22).

We have been obliged, in some measure, to anticipate the course of this history, in order to exhibit the series of conflicts between the Lord and the unbelieving people. But there is another and higher fact to which this chapter points. We see in it the royal consciousness of Jesus gradually unfolding with increasing majesty. 1. Christ restores the wavering Baptist to the pristine confidence of his faith. 2. He presents the Baptist to the people as Elijah, who, according to Malachi, was to precede the advent of the royal Angel of the Covenant. 3. He places him by His own side, as sharing that rejection which Himself had met from His life. 4. In His indignation on account of the unbelief of Galilee, He manifests His royal dignity by announcing the coming judgment. 5. This dignity He manifests still further by a grand hymn of praise to His Father, and by the revelation of His own majesty. 7. He graciously invites those who are weary and heavy laden to find rest in Him in the kingdom of meekness, of patience, and of holy suffering.

---

1. *The Baptist wavers, but the Lord remains stedfast, and restores His wavering friend.* CH. XI. 1–6.

1 And it came to pass, when Jesus had made an end of commanding his twelve dis-
2 ciples, he departed thence to teach and to preach in their cities. Now when John had
heard in the prison the works of Christ, he sent two of his [through his][1] disciples,
3 And said unto him, Art thou he that should come [that cometh],[2] or do we look [shall
4 we look][3] for another? Jesus answered and said unto them, Go and shew John again
[report to John][4] those things which ye do hear and see:
5 The blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the
deaf hear, the dead are raised up, and the poor have the gospel preached to them.
6 And blessed is *he*, whosoever shall not be offended in [at] me.

[1] Ver. 2.—The reading: διὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ, *through* His disciples, adopted by Lachmann and Tischendorf, is strongly supported by Codd. B., C., D., etc. But even Origen and other fathers favor the reading: δύο, and this corresponds at all events with the actual fact as stated by Luke vii. 19. [Διά is undoubtedly the original reading, supported by the oldest MSS., including the Cod. Sinaiticus, and adopted also by Tregelles, Alford, Wordsworth; while δύο is a correction from Luke vii. 19. *Lectio difficilior primatum tenet.*—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 3.—[Or: *the coming One*, ὁ ἐρχόμενος, הַבָּא, *i. e.*, the Messiah. *See* Com.—P. S.]

[3] Ver. 3.—[Προσδοκῶμεν is the conjunctive here. *See* Com.]

[4] Ver. 4.—[The word *again* in the E. V. does not mean here *a second time*, but represents the preposition ἀπό in ἀπαγγείλατε. But *report, make known to*, is a better translation. *See* the Dictionaries, *s. verbo*.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1. **Thence.**—From the place whence He had sent His disciples, somewhere to the south of Capernaum.

To teach and to preach.—It was during this journey that Jesus soon afterward reached Magdala, where He was anointed by the woman who had been a sinner, and then Nain, where He raised the widow's son. During His onward course, a number of female disciples gathered around Him and ministered unto

Him, Luke viii. 2.—On this occasion He was overtaken by the messengers of John, who had been committed to prison in the later part of the autumn of the year 781. The journey closed with the appearance of Jesus at the festival of Purim in the year 782, after which the Baptist was executed.

In their cities, *αὐτῶν*.—Fritzsche (after Gerhard): In the cities where the Apostles had already preached. To this Meyer objects, that Jesus followed immediately upon His disciples. But if the disciples had distributed themselves over the different cities which Jesus afterward visited in succession, they must have been considerably in advance of Him. Meyer's own explanation—in the cities of those to whom He went—amounts to a mere tautology. Euthym. Zigabenus: the birth-places of the Apostles.

Ver. 2. **In the prison.**—In the fortress of Machærus, Joseph. *Ant.* xviii. 5, 2.—The castle of Machærus, on the southern border of Peræa, toward Moabitis—probably the modern Mkaur—was, after Jerusalem, the strongest fortress of the Jews, being protected on all sides by deep valleys. It fell into the hands of the Romans after the destruction of Jerusalem (Joseph. *De Bello Jud.* vii. 6, 1).

The works of Christ.—Probably referring to His mode of working, and more especially to the events above recorded; His gracious intercourse with publicans and sinners (ch. ix., etc.). The Baptist would obtain from his disciples the latest reports of the works of Christ.

He sent.—Following the reading διά, instead of δύο, we might feel almost inclined with Meyer to take πέμψας absolutely, and to connect διὰ τῶν, κ.τ.λ., with εἶπεν αὐτῷ. *He sent and said unto Him by his disciples.* But this would scarcely give a good meaning. Accordingly, whatever view we may take of the reading διά, we must join πέμψας with the words that follow (de Wette).

Ver. 3. **Art Thou He?**—Σύ is put first by way of emphasis.—Ὁ ἐρχόμενος, **He that cometh**, הַבָּא, a designation of the Messiah, which, according to Ps. xl. 8,* would be peculiarly suitable at that time, and especially in the circumstances of the Baptist; comp. John i. 27.

Προσδοκῶμεν, in the conjunctive, **shall we look**, or **are we to look**,† and not in the indicative.—The old explanation of the passage (Origen, Chrysostom, etc.; Calvin, Beza, Melanchthon, Stier), that John himself felt no doubts at all, but that he sent this embassy to Jesus for the sake of his disciples, who doubted, is not supported by the text, and can only have originated in a desire to vindicate the Baptist, or else to obviate an objection against the doctrine of inspiration, since John had previously proclaimed that Jesus was the Messiah [iii. 14, 16; John i. 29]. But these commentators ignore the fact, that if such were the case, John would have had recourse to the doubtful expedient of assuming a false appearance and simulating difficulties which he had not felt; they vindicate his orthodoxy at the expense of his morality. Similarly do they ignore the history of the Old Testament saints, all of whom stumbled at some one of the great critical periods in their lives (Moses, David, Elijah, Job). Specially striking here is the analogy between Elijah on Mount Horeb and his antitype John. But, on the other hand, we do not suppose (with Meyer, and many others, commencing even with Tertullian) that the Baptist had cherished any dogmatic doubt as to the Messiahship of Jesus. In our opinion, the two views must be combined,—that John, in the midst of his mental perplexities and trials, was offended by the kindly and gentle mode of Christ's activity (Paulus, Olshausen, Ebrard, and others), and that his embassy was designed to determine the Lord to manifest Himself openly as the Messiah, by some solemn act of judgment (Lightfoot, Hase, and others). Above all must we clearly realize the situation of the Baptist. During a long and dreary winter had he been imprisoned in the lonely fortress of Machærus. Meantime Herod Antipas was in the immediate neighborhood, indulging in every kind of luxury; while Herodias, with whom he lived in adulterous connection, meditated vengeance upon the bold preacher who had denounced her sin. When preaching the baptism of the Spirit, John had also proclaimed the coming baptism of fire, or the impending judgment. At this period the disciples of the Baptist returned from their visit to Jesus, full of indignation, and reported to the captive and offended ascetic that Jesus accepted invitations to feasts with publicans and sinners. It was impossible for John to doubt either his own mission, or the vision he had seen. But he might doubt the conduct of the Lord, whom he had owned as Messiah. Hence his embassy. It was prompted by doubt and disappointment about Christ's conduct; by an inordinate desire for His more public manifestation; by an Elijah-like wrath on account of the corruptness of the court and world; by a desire him-

* [Olshausen derives the designation from Ps. cxviii. 26: "Blessed is He that cometh;" Hengstenberg from Mal. iii. 1: "Behold He cometh."—P. S.]

† [Dr. Lange and his Edinb. trsl. add here: "*after the Vulgate, etc.*" But this is an error. The Vulgate translates: *expectamus* (indicative). So also Tertullian (*Adv. Marcionem*, Ab. iv. chap. 18), Erasmus, Beza, Fritzsche. But Bengel, de Wette, and Meyer more correctly regard it as a deliberative conjunctive which agrees better with the psychological condition of John and his disciples at the time. Comp. Mark xii. 14: δῶμεν ἢ μὴ δῶμεν. De Wette adds: "This question decidedly indicates doubt, if not concerning the Messianic mission, at least respecting His Messianic activity or mode of proceeding which did not fall in with the theocratic notions of the Baptist." Others regard the question merely as a question of impatient zeal and indirect admonition to proceed faster. But even this would imply a certain discontent on the part of John. The same is true of Alford's explanation that John, hearing the contradictory reports concerning the works of Christ, intended to bring him, through this embassy, to an open profession of His Messiahship, and thus incurred a share of the same rebuke which Mary received at Cana (John ii. 4). Most of the fathers on the other hand, with the exception of Tertullian. *Adv. Marc.* iv. 18, Opera omnia, ed. Oehler, tom. ii. p. 208 (not iv. 5, as Dr. Wordsworth misquotes), especially Origen, Chrysostom, Theophylact, Jerome, Ambrose, Hilary, and Augustine, deny that John was in any doubt. Stier among the modern German, and Wordsworth among the English, commentators, elaborately defend the patristic view. The latter regards this sending of his disciples as the crowning act of the ministry of John, who thus guarded against a schism between his own disciples and those of Jesus, and bequeathed his disciples to Christ. I agree substantially with Dr. Lange's view, viz: that John (like all saints in this world) was temporarily under a cloud of depression and doubt, not respecting the Messiahship of Christ (as Meyer in a long note, pp. 244 and 245, 4th ed., asserts, contrary to vers. 7 and 8), but respecting the slow and unostentatious mode of His manifestation, and the true nature of His kingdom. It is very plain, what Lange does not notice, that the answer of our Saviour is directed to John himself (ἀπαγγείλατε Ἰωάννῃ), and not to his disciples, which implies that he needed it as much as they, for his own spiritual comfort and encouragement. That the message of Christ had the desired effect upon both may be inferred from the martyrdom of John and from the action of his disciples, who "took up his body and buried it and came and *told Jesus*," Matt. xiv. 12.—P. S.]

self to witness the manifestation of that kingdom of heaven which he had announced; above all, by ardent longing for a decisive word. But the faithfulness and strength of this friend of Jesus, in the midst of his weakness, appears even in the form of his message—straightforward and directly to Jesus. This characteristic is the earnest of his victory.

Ver. 5. **The blind see,** etc.—The evidence of the Messiah's working as given by the prophets, Isa. xxxv. 5; lxi. 1. The cleansing of lepers and raising the dead, Ezek. xxxvi. and xxxvii. [Comp. the raising of the daughter of Jairus, ix. 18–26, and of the widow's son at Nain, which, in the Gospel of Luke, immediately precedes this embassy, Luke vii. 11, 18. P. S.] Most commentators refer the expression poor to spiritual poverty; Meyer, to the national misfortunes of Israel. The statement with reference to these poor must, of course, be taken in a limited sense; just as that about the blind, the lame, etc.,—to all of whom it only applied on condition of their susceptibility to the influence of Christ.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. As the representative of the law, the prophet is another Moses: he may call for lightning, for thunder, or for fire from heaven. As messenger of the gospel, the prophet is only a precursor of Christ; and hence has not attained the full height of Christianity, especially in regard to patience under suffering. In this respect, also, it holds true that the least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he.—From the inquiry of the Baptist—*shall we wait for another?*—we learn the extent of his temptation. In the case of Israel, this query has, alas! been answered affirmatively, and they wait for "another," to their own condemnation. But with John the difficulty arose from the knowledge that Messiah would also appear as Judge. And although he could not be ignorant of the difference between the suffering and the glorified Messiah, yet he was not aware of the distance intervening between the advent of the one and of the other; and his impatience was all the greater that he did not even see the Messiah suffering, in the strictest sense of the word. But the special object of his inquiry seems to have been, to urge Jesus *publicly to declare Himself* before all the people.

2. Formerly (in ch. ix.), Jesus had met the disciples of the Baptist by recalling to their minds the last testimony of the Baptist concerning Himself (the Bridegroom and His friend). He now replies to the Baptist, whose warrant was derived from the prophecies of Isaiah (ch. xl.), by appealing to another part of these predictions (ch. xxxv. and lx.), nay, by referring him even to the prophetic figure of the advent of the Lord through the wilderness. John impatiently longed for assistance, for retaliation, and for the vengeance of God. This was the occasion of his offence. Jesus replied by reminding him of the characteristics of Messiah in Isa. xxxv. 5, which are intended to meet such impatience as that of the Baptist. For, in the verses preceding those quoted by Christ, we read: "Strengthen ye the weak hands, and confirm the feeble knees. Say ye to them that are of a fearful (hasty) heart, Be strong, fear not: *behold, your God cometh to vengeance, even God cometh to a recompense, that He may save you.* Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened," etc.—The description of the Messiah which follows—the transition from physical to spiritual deliverance, and the connection between the two—the relation between these deliverances and the character of the Messiah as drawn by Isaiah—lastly, the connection between this description and that of his own situation,—could not but have a beneficial and quickening influence upon John, especially when taken along with the concluding words, which would recall the prediction in Isa. viii. 14.

3. The conclusion of Christ's reply to the Baptist indicated that the miracles of Jesus were also intended as emblems of spiritual deliverance. This view has been entertained by all sound interpreters, and only called in question on insufficient grounds. Lastly, we infer from this passage, that the miracles of Jesus were also designed to serve as evidence of His Messianic mission and Divine nature.

4. Hitherto Jesus had carefully avoided publicly taking the name of Messiah. John now urged Him to assume that title. This might easily have led to a popular movement in favor of John. But in His reply, Jesus combined the highest wisdom with the highest power: He appealed to His works, by which John could not fail to recognize Him as the Messiah; while at the same time He refused to yield to the suggestion of John, and openly avow Himself the Messiah.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Jesus everywhere accompanies His honest messengers, to confirm their work.—Jesus teaches and preaches *in the cities of His faithful witnesses* (in their fields of labor: schools, churches, institutions, and works).—The call of the Lord penetrates everywhere, even within prison-walls.—The embassy of John the Baptist to the Lord, an evidence of strength in weakness. 1. An evidence of his weakness. Former joyous certitude of the Baptist; his present offence. Explained by his situation and his Old Testament character. Courage to bear suffering and the cross was only preparing. The temptations of saints. 2. Evidence of his strength: John addresses the Saviour, even as Christ Himself, in His last trial on the cross, appealed to the Father: *My God, My God,* etc.—The inquiry of the Baptist: *Shall we look for another?*—a wavering between truth and error: 1. True, in so far as it referred to the second advent of Christ; 2. false, as a misunderstanding of the first advent of Christ; 3. a doubt, or uncertainty as to the connection between the first and the second advent of Christ.—Glorious answer, by which the Lord in His strength restores His zealous friend in his weakness: 1. Glorious in its contents; 2. glorious in its humility and in its wisdom (He avoids the declaration that He did all this, and that He was the Messiah); 3. glorious in its mode of expression (reference to the passage in Isaiah in its context); 4. glorious in its promise (the dead are raised—which applied especially to John—and to the poor, etc.).—The miracles of Jesus an evidence of His claims and character.—The physical miracles of Jesus, signs and seals of His spiritual miracles: 1. Signs preceding them; 2. seals following them.—Blessed is he, whosoever shall not be offended at Me: 1. Deep import of this saying (Whosoever shall not be offended at My infinite patience with the world, at My readiness to suffer, at My delay of judgment); 2. solemn warning: to judge and decide hastily may lead even to apostasy; 3. the great promise: he that overcometh the temptation to be offended in Christ, has conquered and is saved.

2. *The authority of the Baptist as preparing the way for the Messiah vindicated.* CH. XI. 7–15.

7 And as they departed,[1] Jesus began to say unto the multitudes concerning John,
What went ye out into the wilderness to see?[2] A reed shaken with [by] the wind?
8 But what [What then] went ye out for[3] to see? A man clothed in soft raiment?[4]
9 behold, they that wear soft *clothing* are in kings' houses. But what went ye out for
10 to see? A prophet?[5] yea, I say unto you, and more than a prophet. For this is *he*,
of whom it is written, Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, which shall pre-
11 pare thy way before thee. Verily I say unto you, Among them that are born of
women there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist: notwithstanding, he that
12 is least[6] in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he. And from the days of John the
Baptist until now the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence [is assaulted by storm],[7] and
13 the violent take it by force. For all the prophets and the law prophesied until John.
14 And if ye will receive *it*, this is Elias [the Elijah], which was for to come [who was to
15 come]. He that hath ears to hear,[8] let him hear.

[1] Ver. 7.—[Lit.: *And as these were departing*, τούτων δὲ πορευομένων.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 7.—[Conant and the revised N. T. of the Am. Bible Union: *behold*, for *see*, to express more fully the meaning of θεάσασθαι, *to gaze, to look upon*, as a public spectacle.—P. S.]

[3] Ver. 8.—[*For* is unnecessary; ἀλλὰ τί ἐξήλθετε ἰδεῖν.]

[4] Ver. 8.—[Correct as to the sense. The text. rec. (with Cod. Alex. as edited by Cowper) reads ἱματίοις after μαλακοῖς, probably from Luke vii. 25. Codd. Sinait., Vaticanus, the Latin Vulgate (*mollibus*), and other ancient authorities omit it. So Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Alford. Lachmann retains the noun, but in brackets.—P. S.]

[5] Ver. 9.—[After an ancient reading of Cod. B.: *But why went ye out? to see a prophet?* ἀλλὰ τί ἐξήλθατε; προφήτην ἰδεῖν; Lange, with Tischendorf, Meyer, and Alford (who, however, omits the punctuation after ἐξήλθατε, regarding the whole as one sentence) adopt this reading, which has now the additional weight of the Cod. Sinaiticus; but Lachmann and Tregelles defend the usual reading: ἀλλὰ τί ἐξήλθατε ἰδεῖν; προφήτην; the only real difference is as to the position of ἰδεῖν.—P. S.]

[6] Ver. 11.—[Lit.: *less*, or *the lesser*, ὁ μικρότερος. So Lange, van Ess, the Latin Vulgate (*minor*), and all the older English versions, Wiclif's, Tyndale, Cranmer, Geneva (*less*), the Rhemish (*the lesser*). But Luther (*der Kleinste*), de Wette (*der Geringste*), and the authorized English version (*least*) render the word in the superlative. Dr. J. A. Alexander *ad loc.* calls this "one of the few groundless innovations introduced by the translators of King James' Bible." But this is too hasty. The translation depends on what we supply to the comparative ὁ μικρότερος. If we supply: *than John the Baptist*, *less* or *the lesser* is the proper translation; but if we supply: *than all others* (τῶν ἄλλων) which is likewise allowable (*see* Winer, p. 218) and even preferable, the English idiom seems to require *he that is least*, or *the least*. *See* Exeg. Notes.—P. S.]

[7] Ver. 12.—[In Greek: βιάζεται, Lange: *wird mit Sturm angelaufen*; Luther: *leidet Gewalt* (*suffers violence*). All English versions from Wiclif to that of King James have: *suffereth violence* after the Vulgate: *vim patitur*. *See* Exeg. Notes.—P. S.]

[8] Ver. 15.—The verb ἀκούειν is omitted by Tischendorf [and Alford] after Codd. B., C., etc. [But Cod. Sinait. has it. —P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 7. **Jesus began to say.**—The Lord hastened by His commendation to restore the authority of the Baptist, which he himself by his embassy had endangered.

A reed.—The figure is derived from the lower banks of Jordan, where reeds grew in abundance; referring to a person wavering and easily influenced by outward circumstances (Olshausen, Meyer). With special allusion to what had just taken place: John will not waver in his faith, though on this occasion he seemed to do so. Some critics have taken the word in a negative sense: Surely ye would not see a reed, etc. (Grotius, de Wette, etc.). This, however, were not only idle, but would weaken the pregnant expression, "*shaken by the wind.*"

Ver. 8. **What then.**—Ἀλλά, *but*, implies a silent negation.

In soft raiment.—The μαλακὰ ἱμάτια, or only μαλακά, according to B., D., Z., etc., are a mark of effeminate and luxurious persons. Under the first simile, Christ shows that John was not wavering in his faith; by the second, He proves that he had not dispatched his embassy from selfishness, or cowardly fear for his life. Both similes presuppose the fact, that His hearers had formerly regarded John as a person entirely inaccessible to such motives. The Saviour would now recall their former feelings of veneration for the Baptist. The antithesis, **they that wear soft clothing,** alludes to the enemies of John at the court of Herod Antipas, who were the occasion of his imprisonment.

Ver. 9. **One who is more than a prophet,** περισσότερον.—Fritzsche takes this as masculine; Meyer, as neuter, which seems to agree better with the context. John was more than the prophets, as being the precursor of the Messiah. The meaning is, You have seen one who is greater than the prophets, although you have not understood his character.

Ver. 10. **Of whom it is written,** Malachi iii. 1. —In the original: "Behold, I will send My messenger, that he may prepare the way before Me: and suddenly cometh to His temple the Lord whom ye seek, and the Messenger of the Covenant, whom ye desire: behold, He cometh, saith the Lord of hosts." In the Hebrew, Jehovah identified Himself with Messiah when announcing the forerunner; while in Matthew a distinction is made, and the text is presented as embodying a promise of God to the Messiah.

Ver. 11. **Among those born of women.**— Job xiv. 1, etc., יְלוּד אִשָּׁה, a general designation of man, more especially with reference to mankind before the coming of Christ. We must not overlook

the use of the plural number. Gal. iv. 4 is not a parallel passage, but rather indicates the contrast. The expression, "born of *a woman*," differs from that, "born *of women*," just as "*Son of Man*" from "*man*." The former expression is specially intended to refer to the human limitations of Christ, to His humiliation in the form of a servant.

There hath not risen a greater.—Not merely a greater prophet (Rosenmüller, etc.), but, in general, none greater than he. As preparing the way for the Messiah, John represented the highest perfection of the Old Covenant. The antithesis which follows: "*He that is least in the kingdom of heaven*," etc., shows that the expression refers to superiority not in respect of moral righteousness, but of *theocratic development and dignity*. Hence it is needless to make an exception in favor of the patriarchs, as Olshausen proposes.

He that is less [least], ὁ δὲ μικρότερος.—Meyer: Not he that is *least*, as the comparative is never used for the superlative. *See* Winer's *Grammar* (p. 218*). De Wette entertains a different opinion, and translates *least*. But the passage is so important, that unless forced by the use of the language, we are not warranted in deviating from the literal expression, though we do not deny that the rendering, *he that is least*, gives good sense. The meaning is, he who is comparatively less in the kingdom of heaven, *according to the standard of that kingdom* (Cyrill, Theodoret, and others), or who occupies a lower place in it, is greater than John, in respect of the development of his faith and spiritual life. Maldonatus [quotes the logical axiom]: "*Minimum maximi majus est maximo minimi.*" Even the least in the kingdom of the New Testament enjoys what John could not have had, viz., peace in the finished work of Christ, and, with it, patience in suffering and death, and quiet expectation of the second coming of Christ, when every wrong shall be righted. Other commentators have applied the expression, "*less*," to Christ Himself (Chrysostom, Luther, Melanchthon, etc.). "The less," who at the time was eclipsed by the glory of John, will in the kingdom of heaven be greater (the punctuation of the verse being changed), or will as the Messiah excel him. But this interpretation is evidently untenable, as there could be no comparison of the kind between Jesus and John, certainly not without express limitation.†

* [Sixth German ed., Leip., 1855 (§ 35). The original quotes p. 280, which is no doubt an error of the printer. Winer says that we must supply to μικρότερος either (τῶν) ἄλλων, or Ἰωάννου τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ. Meyer (Com., p. 247) prefers the latter and explains (p. 248): "He who shall occupy a lower standpoint or degree of value and dignity in the kingdom of the Messiah, than John the Baptist now occupies in the old theocracy, is greater than he, of whom I have just said such great things." I much prefer to supply τῶν ἄλλων, and explain: John being nearest to Christ and standing at the very threshold of His kingdom is *quoad statum* the greatest of all Old Testament prophets and saints; but the least or humblest Christian who has actually entered into the gospel dispensation is *quoad statum* or as to his standpoint (not as to personal merit) greater than he. It is not denied, however, that John may *hereafter* enter into the kingdom of the Messiah, and then occupy a much higher position than millions of Christians. The comparison refers only to his *present* position in the αἰὼν οὗτος.—P. S.]

† [Dr. Wordsworth, from respect for the fathers, endeavors to combine the interpretation of Chrysostom, Enthymius, Theophylact, with the other, but at the expense of clearness. Alford declares the former to be entirely adverse to the spirit of the whole discourse, and agrees substantially with Meyer. Alexander is here very unsatisfactory, and weakens the force of this profound passage by reducing it simply to this: "All that is really asserted is, that one inferior to John in some respect is greater in another." But in what respects?—P. S.]

Ver. 12. **And from the days.**—The days of John's great usefulness were past. Jesus intimates in passing the coming calamities. He also indicates the *immense contrast* between the days of the Baptist and His own advent.

Suffereth violence, is assaulted by storm, βιάζεται.—Explanations: 1. It is violently persecuted by the enemies, and the violent take it from men (Lightfoot, Schneckenburger, and others). But this is opposed to the context, which is evidently intended to explain the greatness of John, the contrast between the days of the Baptist and those of Christ, and the manifestation of the kingdom of heaven.—2. As referring to the advancement of the kingdom of heaven by violent means: (*a*) Taking βιάζεται in the *middle sense*, as meaning, it *forcibly introduces itself*, *breaks in with violence* (Melanchthon, Bengel, Paulus). But this is incompatible with the expression βιασταί which follows. (*b*) *Passively: Magna vi prædicatur* (Fritzsche); but this is arbitrary. (*c*) *It is taken by violence*, or intense endeavors—in the good sense (Hesychius: βιαίως κρατεῖται).—The expression is evidently metaphorical, denoting the violent bursting forth of the kingdom of heaven, as the kernel of the ancient theocracy, through the husk of the Old Testament. John and Christ are themselves the violent who take it by force,—the former, as commencing the assault; the latter, as completing the conquest. Accordingly, this is a figurative description of the great era which had then commenced.

Ver. 13. **For all the prophets.**—Proof of what had just been stated. Difference between the character of the *old period* and the *new era*. All the prophets prophesied of that era, or predicted it; but they could not call it into existence. [The emphasis lies on **prophesied**, *i. e.*, they *only predicted* the kingdom of heaven, as something *future;* while now, since the coming of Christ, it is an actual reality. In the Greek, the words, **until John**, precede the verb, and are connected with ὁ νόμος. John still belonged to the dispensation of the law, but on the very threshold of the dispensation of the gospel, whose advent he proclaimed. "*Usque ad Johannem lex, ab eo evangelium.*" Comp. Luke xvi. 16.—P. S.]

Ver. 14. **And if ye will receive it.**—The antithesis with the preceding verse—the prophets have prophesied—is here hinted at: now is the time of the fulfilment. The idea itself was before expressed as the kingdom of heaven suffering violence. This then furnishes an explanation of the manner in which it suffereth violence. John was the Elijah who was to come as the precursor of Messiah, according to Mal. iv. 5. The expression was metaphorical, and referred to the character of the precursor of Jesus as that of a prophet of judgment, even as the mission of Elijah had been symbolical of the coming judgment. The Jews, however, understood the passage literally, and expected that Elijah would arise from the dead, and actually appear among them (Wetstein, Lightfoot, Schöttgen). Jesus removed this mistake (comp. Matt. xvii. 12), by acknowledging John as the Elijah of whom Malachi had spoken. In one sense only may the prophecy have been still partially unfulfilled, as the second coming of Christ would also be preceded by judgments. But even then the character and mission of Elijah could only be metaphorical, not literal.

Ver. 15. **He that hath ears to hear, let him hear.**—Comp. ch. xiii. 9, 43; Rev. ii. 7. A proverbial expression to evoke attention, or to mark a

conclusion from certain premises. In the present instance, the inference was obvious. If the time of the first βιαστής was past, the second and greater must be at hand. Thus Christ complied as far as possible with the request of the Baptist to pronounce Himself the Messiah. Those who knew the Scriptures, and believed them, would be able to recognize Him; while at the same time He would not assume the title before the people, since in their minds it was still connected with ideas of rebellion and carnal conquest.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. This passage affords a fresh view of the greatness of Jesus as compared with John, whom He first restores, and then acknowledges before the people, in whose presence John had almost reproved Him. The contrast appears most clear and distinct between John and Christ, between the Old and the New Testaments, between calm development and a stormy era. And as John had first testified of Christ, so Christ now bears testimony of John.

2. In truth, the Baptist himself was a sufficient reply to his own inquiry—*Art Thou He?* His being offended implied a doubt in his own mission. Hence also it could only be transient.

3. The violent manifestation of the kingdom of heaven upon earth was brought about by the holy violence of John and Jesus, who ushered this kingdom into a sinful world.

4. [Dr. THOMAS SCOTT: "In every age, 'the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force.' . . . They who are determined at all adventures, to find admission, will surely succeed: but such as postpone the concerns of their souls to worldly interest, pleasures, and diversions, will be found to come short of it; as well as those who seek salvation in any other way than by repentance toward God and faith in his beloved Son." MATTHEW HENRY: "The kingdom of heaven was never intended to indulge the ease of triflers, but to be the rest of them that labor." Comp. Luke xiii. 24: "*Strive* (ἀγωνίζεσθε) to enter in at the *strait* gate."—P. S.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The glory of the Lord as it appears by the side of John.—Entire freedom from all jealousy in its full majesty (John and Christ).—The commendation of the Baptist as reflecting greater glory upon the Lord than even on John: 1. As exalting the Baptist; 2. still more the Lord (uttered at such a moment, after such experience, in such terms, with such reservations as to His own person).—In what sense those who are least in the New Covenant are greater than the greatest under the Old.—Every fresh manifestation of the kingdom of heaven requiring heroism of faith.—Christ bringing the kingdom of heaven to this earth, and at the same time taking the kingdom of heaven by force for this earth.—The kingdom of heaven passing from its typical form into reality through the faithfulness of His witnesses.—Holy violence.—Christ's perfect suffering constituting His perfect violence.*—Clearness of the Old Testament testimony about Christ.—*He that hath ears to hear, let him hear:* the loudest call to a life of faith: 1. As pointing to our original calling, to hear; 2. as condemning the sin, that man has ears, yet does not hear; 3. as an admonition to come to the knowledge of Christ by our hearing.—Properly to understand the Scriptures, is to know Christ.—Every call of God is at the same time both general and special.

Starke:—Does it become a servant of the cross of Christ to imitate the pomp of the world, or to trim his sails to the wind?—Wavering preachers cannot expect stable hearers.—They who are under the influence of the love of the world, will scarcely prove fit to root it out of the hearts of others, Luke x. 30.—*Hedinger*:—We must be thoroughly in earnest if we are ever to reach heaven.—As the substance exceeds the shadow, so the grace of the New, that of the Old Testament, Col. ii. 17; Heb. viii. 5; x. 1.—*Gerlach*:—Knowledge of Christ is the sole standard for measuring spiritual greatness.

Heubner:—Jesus commends John after his disciples have left His presence. Let this serve as an example.†—Jesus knew the Baptist better than the latter knew himself.—Human opinions are like the wind: beware of being their weathercock.—Independence a high honor and glory.

* [So also on the part of his disciples. Ambrose in Luke xi. 5 (as quoted by Wordsworth): *Vim facimus Domino, non compellendo, sed flendo; non provocando injuriis, sed lacrymis exorando. O beata violentia! Hæc sunt arma fidei nostræ.*—P. S.]

† [Comp. the remarks of Matthew Henry: "Christ spoke thus honorably of John, but *as they departed*, just as they were gone, Luke vii. 24. He would not so much as seem to flatter John, nor have these praises reported of him. Though we must be forward to give to all their due praise for their encouragement, yet we must avoid everything that looks like flattery, or may be in danger of puffing them up. Pride is a corrupt humor, which we must not feed either in others or in ourselves."—P. S.]

---

3. *The Baptist and the Son of Man, as judged by a childish generation.* CH. XI. 16–19.

16 But whereunto shall I liken this generation? It is like unto children sitting in the
17 markets, and calling unto their fellows [to the others],[1] And saying, We have piped
unto you, and ye have not danced; we have mourned [wailed, sung dirges] unto you,[2]
18 and ye have not lamented [beat the breast].[3] For John came neither eating nor drink-
19 ing, and they say, He hath a devil [demon]. The Son of man came eating and drink-
ing, and they say, Behold a man gluttonous [a glutton], and a wine-bibber,[4] a friend of
publicans and sinners. But Wisdom[5] is justified of [on the part of][6] her children.

[1] Ver. 16.—Lachmann: τοῖς ἑταίροις [Vulg.: *coæqualibus, companions, playmates*], after G., S., U., V., etc. [Lachmann quotes as his authorities B. and C., as previously compared by others; but the printed edition of Cod. Ephræmi

Syri (C.) by Tischendorf, and Angelo Mai's ed. of the Cod. Vaticanus (B.) both read *ἑτέροις*. Buttmann's edition of the latter, however, sustains Lachmann, and the *ἀλλήλοις* in Luke vii. 32 favors *ἑταίροις*.—P. S.] Griesbach: *τοῖς ἑτέροις aliis*], after most Codd. [including Cod. Sinait.]. So also Tischendorf [and Tregelles. Alford does not read *ἑτέροις*, as stated by Conant, but *ἑταίροις*. So also Wordsworth. Lange's interpretation requires *ἑτέροις*.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 17.—Lachmann and Tischendorf omit the second *ὑμῖν*, following B., C., [Cod. Sinait.], etc.

[3] Ver. 17.—[Lange more literally: *Wir haben (euch) die Todtenklage gemacht, und ihr habt nicht (im Chor) gejammert;* Scrivener: *We have sung dirges unto you, and ye have not smote the breast;* Andrew Norton: *We have sung a dirge to you, and you have not beat your breasts;* Conant and the revised version of the Am. Bible Union: *We sang the lament, and ye beat not the breast.* Θρηνεῖν refers to the funeral dirge, and *κόπτεσθαι* (middle verb) to the oriental expression of sorrow by beating the breast, comp. Ezek. xx. 34 (Sept.: *κόψεσθε τὰ πρόσωπα*); Matt. xxiv. 30; Luke xviii. 13; xxiii. 48, and the dictionaries. The authorized version is very vague.—P. S.]

[4] Ver. 19.—[*Wine-bibber* is a felicitous translation of the Anacreontic *οἰνοπότης*. Dr. Conant and the N. T. of the Am. Bible Union: *a glutton and a winedrinker.* Luther and Lange stronger: *ein Fresser und Weinsäufer.*—P. S.]

[5] Ver. 19.—[We prefer capitalizing *Wisdom* as in older editions of the Bible. *See* Exeg. Notes.—P. S.]

[6] Ver. 19.—[Lange: *von Seiten ihrer Kinder.* So also Meyer, and Conant, who quotes Meyer and refers to Acts ii. 22 for the same use of *ἀπό*, instead of *ὑπό* (*ἄνδρα ἀπὸ θεοῦ ἀποδεδειγμένον εἰς ὑμᾶς δυνάμεσι, κ.τ.λ.*).—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 16. **But whereto shall I liken this generation?**—It seemed as if John were about to identify himself with his generation in reference to the Lord. But Jesus restores him to his right place, and exhibits Himself and the Baptist as one in opposition to the spirit of the age. A transition from His verdict upon John to that on his contemporaries, with special reference to the present and impending fate of the Baptist. While John and Jesus were engaged in spiritual *labors* and *warfare*, the *conquest of the kingdom of heaven*, "*this generation*" would only seek *childish amusement.*

It is like unto children.—The common interpretation of this passage (first proposed by Chrysostom, and recently defended by Stier) is, that the expression, *piping* and *mourning*, refers to John and Jesus, and that the Jews were the other children who refused to give heed. But this is entirely untenable. For, 1. "*this generation*" is likened to children playing in the market-place. 2. These same children are represented as urging the objections which Christ subsequently puts into the mouth of the people. Both in the simile and in the explanation of it, the Jews are introduced as speaking. 3. If these terms had referred to Christ and John, the order of the figures would have been reversed; *ἐθρηνήσαμεν—ηὐλήσαμεν*. 4. There is a manifest antithesis between the idea of children playing, and the former figure of taking the kingdom of heaven by violence. 5. The conduct of the children is represented as inconsistent and contradictory. 6. We have the fact, that this generation really expected that its prophets should be influenced by the passing whims of their carnal views and inclinations. Hence we conclude that the *piping* and *mourning* children represent the Jews, and the *ἕτεροι*, "*the others*," John and Jesus. These *ἕτεροι* form no part of the company represented as playing in the market.

[So also de Wette, and Meyer, p. 251: "The *παιδία* are the Jews; the *ἕτεροι* are John and Jesus." But I object to this interpretation, the reverse of the other, for the following reasons: 1. Because it is contrary to the parallel passage in Luke vii. 32, where we have *ἀλλήλοις*, *to one another*, instead of *ἑτέροις*, so that the playing children and the silent children form but *one* company, although disagreed among themselves (as the Jews were in fact with their many sects and their contradictory carnal notions about the Messiah). The same is true, if we read with Lachmann: *ἑταίροις*. 2. Because it would represent Christ and John as the dissatisfied and disobedient party. 3. Finally, I reject both interpretations, that refuted, and that defended by Dr. Lange; because John and Christ could with no degree of propriety and good taste be represented as playmates and comrades of their wayward contemporaries. We conclude, therefore, that *both* classes of children refer to the wayward, capricious, and discontented Jews; the children who play the mock wedding and the mock funeral representing the active, the silent children who refuse to fall in with their playmates, the passive discontent, both with the austerity of John and with the more cheerful and genial conduct of Christ. So Olshausen: "The sense is this: the generation resembles a host of ill-humored children, whom it is impossible to please in any way; one part desires this, and the other that, so that they cannot agree upon any desirable or useful occupation." Compare also the illustrative remarks of Wordsworth, who in this case dissents from his favorite Chrysostom: "By the children [or rather *one class* of the children] many interpreters understand the Baptist and our Lord. But this seems harsh. The *γενεά* itself is said to be *ὁμοία παιδίοις*, and the querulous murmur of the children, complaining that others would not humor them in their fickle caprices, is compared to the discontented censoriousness of that generation of the Jews, particularly of the Pharisees, who could not be pleased with any of God's dispensations, and rejected John and Christ, as they had done the prophets before them. The sense, therefore, is, Ye are like a band of wayward children, who go on with their own game, at one time gay, at another grave, and give no heed to any one else, and expect that every one should conform to them. You were angry with John, because he would not dance to your piping, and with Me, because I will not weep to your dirge. John censured your licentiousness, I your hypocrisy; you, therefore, vilify both, and 'reject the good counsel of God,' who has devised a variety of means for your salvation (Luke vii. 30)."—P. S.]

Ver. 17. **We have piped unto you,** etc.—Among the Jews, Greeks, and Romans, it was customary to play the flute especially at marriage dances: Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* Similarly, solemn *wailing* was customary at burials. The expression, *danced*, corresponds with piping, just as the funeral dirge was expected to evoke lamentation among the mourners, especially by *beating the breast* (hence the expression, Ezek. xxiv. 16; Matt. xxiv. 30, etc). The figure is that of children imitating the festivities or solemnities of their seniors, and expecting other children who take no part in their play to share their amusement.

Ver. 18. **For John came neither eating nor drinking.**—A hyperbolical expression, referring to

his abstinence and asceticism, as contradistinguished from Christ's freer conduct. **And they say, He has a demon** [δαιμόνιον].—A demon of melancholy (John x. 20). The figure of piping, to which John responded not, is all the more striking, that the spurious marriage at the court of Herod was the occasion of John's imprisonment; and again, the dance of the daughter Herodias, that of his execution. In another place also, Jesus says that the Jews would have liked to use John, as it were, by way of religious diversion (John v. 35).

Ver. 19. **The Son of Man came eating and drinking.**—Referring to His more free mode of conduct, and with special allusion to the feast in the house of Matthew, in the company of publicans and sinners [and the wedding feast at Cana]. This induced the Pharisees to pronounce an unfavorable judgment of Christ. Accordingly, His contemporaries already commenced to condemn Him as a destroyer of the law. It has been suggested, that our Lord here hints at the occurrence formerly related, when He had admonished one of His disciples to "let the dead bury their dead." But it seems more likely, that if the figure contains any allusion to a definite event, it referred to the imputation of John's disciples, that during the captivity of their master, and until after his death, Jesus should abstain from taking part in any festivities. But we are inclined to take a broader view of the subject, and to regard the statement of the Lord as referring to the anger and sorrow of the people about their national position, with which our Lord could not sympathize in that particular form. Their carnal mourning for the outward depression of Israel could meet with no response from Him.

Ver. 19. **But Wisdom,** etc.—Final judgment of the Lord as to the difference obtaining between the people, John, and Himself. The σοφία. Jerome: *Ego, qui sum dei virtus et sapientia dei juste fecisse ab apostolis meis filiis comprobatus sum.* Chrysostom, Theophylact, Castellio: Wisdom, which has become manifest in Jesus. De Wette: A personification of the wisdom of Jesus.—The term undoubtedly refers to the spirit of the theocracy as manifested in John and in Christ, and which bears the name of *Wisdom* (Prov. viii. and ix.; Sir. xxiv.), because the conduct of John and of Jesus was guided by a definite object, and derived from the spirit of Wisdom in revelation.*

Is justified on the part (or, **at the hands**) **of her children.**—Elsner, Schneckenburger: Judged, reproved, *i. e.*, by the Jews, who should have been its disciples.† Ewald: Really justified by that foolish generation, since their contradictory judgments confuted each other, and so confirmed Wisdom. De Wette takes the aor. in the sense of habit, and gives the statement a more general sense: The children of Wisdom (*i. e.*, those who receive it, or My disciples) give, by their conduct, cause for approving Wisdom. Meyer, opposing de Wette's view of the aor.: Wisdom has been justified on the part of her children, viz., by their having adopted it. The passage must be read in the light of ver. 25 sqq. In both cases, a joyous prospect is being opened up to their view. Truth and Wisdom have been justified and owned, though neither by the men of this generation nor by the wise and the prudent. But in this passage sorrow seems still to predominate: 1. Wisdom has been traduced by this generation, and obliged to justify herself; 2. for this purpose, new children had to be born and trained. The word ἀπό might almost lead us to adopt another interpretation. Wisdom was obliged to justify herself by a judicial verdict from the accusation of her children (or rather, ironically, of those who should be her children). But then, this proposition only refers to the occasion or cause of a thing. It is not the children who justify Wisdom, but the means of proving her justification are derived from the testimony which appears in her children.

* [Hence *Wisdom* should be capitalized, as in some editions of the English Version.—P. S.]

† [In this case the sentence would be a solemn irony, or an indignant rebuke of the bad treatment of God's wise and gracious Providence on the part of those who claimed to be its orthodox admirers and authorized expounders. Dr. J. A. Alexander leans to this interpretation. But no clear case of irony (nor of wit, nor of humor) occurs in the discourses of our Saviour. The childlike children of Wisdom in ver. 19 seem to be opposed to the childish and wayward children of this generation in ver. 16. Comp. Bengel, *in Luc.* vii. 35: *Huius Sapientiæ liberi non sunt Pharisæi horumque similes, sed apostoli, publicani et peccatores omnes ex toto populo ad Jesum conversi: quos sic appellat, ad ostendendam suam cum illis necessitudinem et jus conversandi, calumniatorumque perversitatem.*—P. S.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. On this occasion, Jesus foretold the judgment which the world has at all times pronounced on the kingdom of heaven. To the men of this world, the preaching of the law appears too severe, too much opposed to the innocent and lawful enjoyments of life; while the message of pardon meets with the hostility of pharisaical legalists, who describe it as favoring carelessness and shielding sin.

2. The spirit of the world is also accurately delineated in the figure of successive piping and mourning: first, festive enjoyments, and then mourning for the dead. The Wisdom of the kingdom of heaven sanctions the opposite order: first the law, and then the gospel; first death, and then life; first penitence and sorrow, and then joy; first the Baptist, and then Christ.

3. Lastly, this passage serves to show the close connection between the Christology of the synoptical Gospels and the Logos of John, and the Σοφία of the Old Testament and the Jewish Apocrypha.

4. This is the second instance that Christ borrowed a similitude from the market.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Worldly-mindedness, in the garb of spirituality, attempting to make a farce of the solemn duties of spiritual life.—The contemporaries of Jesus, a figure of the common opposition to the gospel at all times.—The world insisting that the prophets of God should take their teaching from its varying opinions.—Puritanical strictness and moral laxity, the two great objections which the world urges against the preaching of the gospel.—From piping to mourning; or, the childish amusements of the world amid the solemnities of life.—Contrast between the wisdom of Christ and the folly of the world: 1. In the case of the latter, amusements are followed by mourning and death; 2. in the case of the former, the solemnity of death by true enjoyment of life.—The Wisdom of the gospel is always justified in her children.—Those who are justified by Christ before God, should justify Him by their lives before the world.

Starke:—From *Hedinger*:—When people dislike a doctrine, they abuse the teachers of it.—*Majus*:—Nobody is more exposed to sinful and rash judgments

than ministers.—*Cramer* :—The children of God cannot escape the judgment of the world, whatever they may do.—If the conduct of Christ called down the rebuke of the world, how much more shall that of upright ministers be censured!—We are not to find fault with, but humbly to submit to, the teaching of heavenly wisdom.

Heubner :—John decried as a fanatic; Christ, as a man of the world: see how the world reads characters!

---

4. *Royal denunciation of Judgment on the cities of Galilee.* CH. XI. 20–24.

20 Then began he to upbraid the cities wherein most of his mighty works [wonderful
21 works, or miracles][1] were done, because they repented not: Woe unto thee, Chorazin!
woe unto thee, Bethsaida! for if the mighty works [miracles], which were done in you,
had been done in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented long ago in sackcloth and
22 ashes. But I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon at the day
23 of judgment, than for you. And thou, Capernaum, which art exalted unto heaven,[2]
shalt be brought down [go down][3] to hell [hades][4]: for if the mighty works [miracles],
which have been done in thee, had been done in Sodom, it would have remained until
24 this day. But I say unto you, That it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in
the day of judgment, than for thee.

[1] Ver. 20.—[Lange, with de Wette, translates δυνάμεις: *Wunder*, justly differing from Luther, who renders simply: *Thaten*. The N. T. has three words for miracles (in the general sense) or supernatural deeds and events: 1) τέρας, which occurs 16 times and is uniformly and correctly rendered in the E. V. *wonder* (an extraordinary, mysterious, and inexplicable phenomenon, portent); 2) δυνάμεις, miracles proper, as the effect of a supernatural power, which is variously translated: *wonderful works* (Matt. vii. 22), more frequently: *mighty works*, and still oftener: *miracles* (Mark ix. 39; Acts ii. 22; viii. 13; 1 Cor. xii. 10, 28, 29; Gal. iii. 5); 3) σημεῖον, *sign*, pointing to the moral aim of the supernatural act; here the E. V. varies somewhat arbitrarily between *sign* (about 40 times), *miracle* (about 20 times), and *wonder* (3 times). Comp. Lange's doctrinal comments on Matt. viii. 1–18, p. 154, and the dictionaries *sub verbis*.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 23.—The reading: ὑψωθεῖσα in K., M., X.; ὑψώθης in Griesbach. Tischendorf, on the authority of E., F., G., etc.; μὴ ὑψωθήσῃ in Lachmann with B., C., D. "The last gives no good sense." Meyer. [It gives good sense if we regard it as a question with the expectation of a negative answer (μή): *Shalt thou be exalted to heaven?* Nay; thou shalt go down to the underworld, or as Irenæus quotes the passage (*Adv. hær.* iv. 36): *Et tu Capernaum, numquid usque ad cœlum exaltaberis? Usque ad inferos descendes.* The reading: μὴ . . . ὑψωθήσῃ is now also sustained by Cod. Sinaiticus, and adopted by Tregelles, Conant, and Alford in the 4th edition.—P. S.]

[3] Ver. 23.—Lachmann, Tischendorf [Alford]: καταβήσῃ, *descend, go down*, after B., D., Vulg., Itala. The *lectio recepta* is taken from Luke x. 15. [Cod. Sinait. sustains the passive καταβιβασθήσῃ, *thou shalt be brought down*.—P. S.]

[4] Ver. 23.—[Lange: *Unterwelt*, *i. e.*, *underworld*. So also Dr. Conant, and the revised version of the Am. B. U. throughout. I prefer *Todtenreich* for the German, and *hades* for the English. The English language, owing to its cosmopolitan or (*sit venia verbo!*) panlinguistic composition, can much easier retain and appropriate for popular use the Greek term than the German. Why should we not use it as well as the terms *paradise*, *Eden*, and many other foreign words which have become perfectly familiar to the reader of the Bible? This translation cuts off all disputes about locality (of which we know nothing certain), and the different renderings which might be proposed, as *underworld*, *spirit world*, *region*, or rather *state of the dead* or *departed*, etc. The important distinction between *hades* (ᾅδης), *i. e.*, the world of *all* the dead, the intermediate spirit world, and *hell* (γέεννα), *i. e.*, the final abode and state of the lost, should be restored in the English Bible, if it should ever be revised. (Comp. footnote on p. 114.) In this passage hades, with its gloomy depth below, is contrasted with the heaven or the blessed height above; comp. Ps. cxxxix. 8; Job xi. 8; Rom. x. 6, 7, and especially Isa. xiv. 15, to which our passage seems to allude; εἰς ᾅδου καταβήσῃ (Babylon). *See* Com.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 20. **Then began He.**—The accent lies on τότε, not on ἤρξατο. According to the account of Luke, the decisive denunciations of Christ on the cities of Galilee occurred at a later period, when He took final leave of them. This is quite in accordance with what we would have expected at the close of His ministry. But even at this stage, partial predictions of judgment must have been uttered, which Matthew, according to his systematic plan, here records in their final and complete form.

Ver. 21. **Chorazin.**—The name occurs neither in the Old Testament nor in Josephus, and in the New Testament only in this place and in Luke xiii. According to Jerome, it was situate two miles from Capernaum. *See* the different conjectures as to its unknown locality in the Encycls., and Robinson, ii. 405. —**Bethsaida** = בֵּית־צַיְדָה commonly rendered, *house of fishes;* or, *home of hunting*, or *catching*. A city of Galilee (John xii. 21), on the western shore of the lake (Mark vi. 45; viii. 22). The home of Peter, of Andrew, and of Philip, John i. 44; xii. 21. —Another town of this name was situate in Lower Gaulonitis, on the eastern side of the lake. Philip the tetrarch elevated it to the rank of a city, giving it the name of *Julias*, after the daughter of the Emperor Augustus (Luke x. 10). The situation of Bethsaida is not marked by any ruins, and wholly unknown.

[According to this passage, **most of the miracles** of Christ were done in these cities of Galilee, and yet not one is recorded in the Gospels as having been done in Chorazin and Bethsaida. A confirmation of John xxi. 25.—P. S.]

Tyre and Sidon.—Heathen cities in the immediate neighborhood. The point of the comparison lay in their being inhabited by a large, busy, heathen population, whose corruptness had been exposed even

in the writings of the prophets. The original seats of the service of Baal.

[**They would have repented.**—The knowledge of our Saviour extended also to contingencies, *i. e.*, to things which *would* have happened under certain conditions. Comp. Henry and Wordsworth, *in loc.*—P. S.]

In sackcloth and ashes.—In the East, it was common for mourners to put on a black garment which resembled a sack, with holes for the arms, and to strew ashes upon the head. Hence this was regarded as the symbol of mourning and of repentance.—Luke: *sitting*: *καθήμεναι*. Mourners and penitents were wont to sit on the ground.

Ver. 23. **Exalted unto heaven,** or highly glorified.—"Not by its rich produce of fishes (Grotius,* Kuinoel, Fritzsche), but by the residence and works of Jesus (Bengel, Paulus)." De Wette.

To hades.—In opposition to heaven—the lowest depth (comp. Ezek. xxxi. 16). The temporal judgments which soon afterward passed over these cities, till their every trace has been swept from the earth, are here referred to, as well as the final judgment.—The Greek word ᾅδης is equivalent to, though not quite identical with, the Hebrew *sheol*, שְׁאוֹל. On the doctrine of Sheol, compare the article "*Hades*" by Güder, in Herzog's *Encycl.* This must not be confounded with *hell* or *gehenna*. The *essential ideas* attaching to hades are: (1) Habitation of the dead before the completion of redemption; (2) contrast between the higher and the lower region, between the place of rest and that of torment, Luke xvi. 19–31; (3) state of imperfectness of the souls in hades—disembodied state, longing, waiting for final decision, 1 Pet. iii. 19; (4) continuance as an intermediate kingdom till the end of the world. *Popular views* concerning it: It was a subterranean place, etc. *Symbolical import:* Depth of misery or of judgment, intermediate states, purifications, to the end of the world.

[J. J. OWEN *in loc.*: "The word here rendered *hell*, is not *gehenna*, but *hades*, the invisible or lower world, where dwell, according to the ancient conception, the shades of the dead. It does not here signify the place of future punishment any more than *heaven*, in the preceding clause, means the seat of bliss where God dwells. Both are figuratively used, to denote great spiritual privileges as well as temporal prosperity [?], and the depth of ruin into which they would fall through the abuse of these privileges."—J. A. ALEXANDER *in loc.*: "*Hell* here means the unseen world, the state of the dead, the world of spirits, without regard to difference of character and condition. . . . It is here used simply in antithesis to *heaven*, and must be explained, accordingly, as meaning the extremest degradation and debasement of a moral kind, but not perhaps without allusion to the loss of all external greatness, and oblivion of the very spot on which the city stood."]

Ver. 24. **Unto you**—comp. **in thee,** ver. 23.—Euthymius Zigal., very correctly: *τὸ μὲν ὑμῖν πρὸς τοὺς πολίτας τῆς πόλεως ἐκείνης εἴρηται, τὸ δὲ σοὶ πρὸς τὴν πόλιν.*

For the land of Sodom.—Compare the history of Sodom in the Book of Genesis, and the art. in the Bibl. Cyclops. Nor must we overlook the contrast between the Dead Sea and the Lake of Tiberias, as, in the former comparison, that between the cities of Galilee and Tyre and Sidon. Lake Gennesareth shall, from the wickedness of the people, descend in judgment to a lower level than the cities of the Dead Sea. The two comparisons are taken from different periods: the one from the present, the other from antiquity; the one from a region over which judgment has already passed, the other from cities which were yet to be judged. But the cities of Galilee had experienced a much more gracious visitation than either the doomed region of the Dead Sea, or heathen Tyre and Sidon. They had been the scene of most of His mighty deeds, and Capernaum had even been chosen as His abode.

[It is a remarkable fact, that the very names and ruins of these three cities on the Lake of Gennesareth have utterly disappeared, and their locality is a matter of dispute among travellers, while even that of Sodom and Gomorrha is pointed out on the shores of the Dead Sea. Thus the fearful prediction of our Saviour has already been literally fulfilled on these cities; but a more terrible spiritual fulfilment is awaiting its inhabitants on the great day of judgment.—P. S.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The woe which Christ here pronounces on the cities of Galilee is a proof that the judgment of hardening had already passed upon them. But clear evidence of this only appeared when Jesus finally forsook Galilee. Still, every woe of judgment pronounced by Christ is the echo of a woe of pity in His heart, and indicates that outward judgments are now unavoidable, since the inward judgment of hardening had already commenced.

2. The Lord here evidently assigns to His miracles the highest power and import in quickening and strengthening faith. Similarly, He knows and perceives that Tyre, Sidon, and Sodom would have repented sooner than those cities of Galilee, which implicitly yielded themselves to the deadening influences of Pharisaism. History has confirmed this prediction so far as this was possible. Tyre became a Christian city; while, by the Lake of Galilee, sprang up Tiberias, the capital of Jewish Talmudism.

[3. Import of the passage, especially the words: *It will be more tolerable*, etc., vers. 22, 24, on the doctrine of *different degrees of punishment*, corresponding to the measure of opportunity enjoyed, and of ingratitude manifested in this life. Comp. Matt. v. 21, 22; x. 15; Luke xii. 47, 48; John ix. 41; xv. 22, 24; Rom. ii. 12. This distinction removes many popular objections to the doctrine of eternal punishment.—P. S.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

How the royal dignity of Christ appeared, both in His compassion and in His indignation about the hardness of His contemporaries.—The woe pronounced by the Lord: 1. A cry of woe in His heart; 2. a cry of woe in the heart of those cities (their judicial

* [It seems improbable that such a man as Grotius should give such a low and silly interpretation. But so it is. He says *in loc.*: "*Hoc non dubito quin ad res huius vitæ pertineat, ut in his quæ sequuntur assurgat oratio. Florebat Capernaumum piscatu, mercatu et quæ alia esse solent commoda ad mare sitarum urbium.*" Even Barnes still speaks in this connection of the successful commerce, temporal wealth and prosperity of Capernaum, although he rises above Grotius by emphasizing the spiritual privileges, which here alone are meant. Stier (*Reden Jesu*, i., p. 491) refers the expression to the lofty situation of Capernaum, which is not much better and besides a matter of geographical uncertainty.—P. S.]

hardening); 3. a cry of woe in the dispensation of outward judgments. Or, 1. a verdict; 2. a prediction; 3. an earnest of judgment.—Jesus taking leave from Galilee, and His taking leave from the temple and from Jerusalem.—The predictions of the Lord confirming His Divine character, even as His miracles had done.—The height of privileges despised, leading to the depth of Divine judgments.—Three chosen cities sunk so low (among them, Bethsaida, the city of the Apostles, and especially Capernaum, that of the Lord Himself).—Christ's mild judgment on the heathen world: 1. An evidence of His unfathomable wisdom; 2. of His inexhaustible mercy; 3. of His Divine penetration.—The different degrees of judgment and of punishment.—The final judgment will throw light on the import of temporal judgments.

[*Quesnel*:—Ver. 20. We cannot complain that we have seen no miracles, since all those of our Creator are exposed to the eyes of our mind and our body, and all those of our Saviour to the eyes of our faith. Let us take to ourselves these reproaches of our Lord, since His miracles also are designed for us.—Ver. 21. An impenitent Christian is worse than a pagan.—Ver. 22. How terrible are God's judgments on the impenitent! Everything will help to overwhelm them at the tribunal of God; the benefits and favors which they have received, as well as the sins which they have committed.—Ver. 23. The proud, who of all sinners are the most difficult to be converted, shall likewise be the most humbled. Pride hardens the heart even more than the greatest sins of impurity. There is nothing more opposite to the Christian religion, the whole design of which is to make us humble. Lord, humble us at present, rather than reserve us for the eternal humiliation of the reprobate!—P. S.]

Starke:—*Zeisius*: The brighter the summer-day, the louder the thunder-storm.—The greater grace, the heavier judgment, John xii. 48; 2 Pet. ii. 11.—Open and notorious sinners will more readily be converted than hypocrites.—As some sins are more heinous than others, so also shall they receive greater condemnation.—Many a nominal Christian will receive heavier punishment than the poor heathen.

Heubner:—Great is the guilt of those who despise the means of grace.—Sometimes places which experience the most gracious visitations are the most barren.—Every one shall be judged according to the measure of the means of grace which he has enjoyed.—Fallacious prosperity of great cities.—The higher they stand in their own imaginations, the lower shall they be cast down.

---

5. *The Son of God displaying the full consciousness of His royal dignity while rejected of men.*

CH. XI. 25–30.

25 At that time Jesus answered and said,[1]
I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth,
Because [That][2] thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent,
And hast revealed them unto [to] babes.
26 Even so,[3] Father; for[4] so it seemed good in thy sight.[5]
27 All things are delivered unto me of [by, ἀπό] my Father:
And no man knoweth the Son, but the Father;
Neither [Nor] knoweth any man the Father, save [but] the Son,
And *he* to whomsoever the Son will reveal *him* [it].
28 Come unto me, all *ye* that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.
29 Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me [become my disciples]; for I am meek and
30 lowly in heart; and ye shall find rest unto [for] your souls. For my yoke *is* easy
[good, wholesome], and my burden is light.

[1] Ver. 25.—[We follow the division of Dr. Lange in the rhythmical arrangement of this incomparable prayer of our Saviour.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 25.—[*That* is the proper meaning of ὅτι here. So Luther, de Wette, Meyer, Lange. All the older English versions from Wiclif to that of James have *because*, following the Latin Vulgata: *quia*.—P. S.]

[3] Ver. 26.—[Better: *Yea*, ναί; the Lat. Vulg. translates: *ita*; Luther, de Wette, Ewald, Lange: *ja*; Tyndale and Author. Vers.: *even so*; Cranmer and Geneva Vers.: *verily*; Rheims Vers. and Conant: *yea*.—P. S.]

[4] Ver. 26.—[Meyer renders ὅτι: *that* (*dass*), as in ver. 25, and makes it dependent on ἐξομολογοῦμαί σοι. So also Conant. But Lange, with Luther, de Wette, and most other versions (Vulg., Wiclif, Tyndale, Rheims, Author. V.), translates *denn*, *for*. Comp. Lange's note.—P. S.]

[5] Ver. 26.—[A far superior version of εὐδοκία ἔμπροσθέν σου, than that of the Romish N. T. of Rheims: *for so hath it well pleased thee* (Vulg.: *sic fuit placitum ante te*); Tyndale: *so it pleaseth thee*; Cranmer and Geneva: *so it was thy good pleasure*. Lange translates: *denn also geschah der Rathschluss, der vor dir stand*. But Luther: *denn es ist also wohlgefällig gewesen vor dir*; de Wette: *denn also geschah dein Wille*; Meyer: *dass so geschah, was wohlgefällig ist vor dir*; Ewald quite literally: *dass* (denn) *solches ward ein Wohlgefallen vor dir*.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 24. **Jesus answered.**—Ἀποκρίνομαι, like עָנָה, to speak on some definite occasion. Meyer: This occasion is not here mentioned, and cannot be inferred. According to Luke x. 21, the return of the Seventy formed this occasion (Strauss and Ebrard); according to Ewald and older commentators, that of the Apostles. To this Meyer objects, that the expression ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ implies that—however probable in itself—such was not the connection which Matthew had in view. In our opinion, the verses

under consideration form, so to speak, a response to the denunciations in the preceding context. The two sections are intended as an antiphony by the Evangelist. Gerlach suggests that the words bear special reference to the disciples who stood before Him. Their presence was virtually an assurance on the part of His heavenly Father: Behold, I have given these unto Thee. And Jesus answered, I thank Thee, O Father, etc.—De Wette takes the expression in a more general sense, as equivalent to, *He commenced:* comp. Matt. xxii. 1; xxviii. 5.* We fully admit, however, that the outward and historical connection is more clearly marked in the Gospel of Luke than in that of Matthew.

I thank Thee [ἐξομολογοῦμαι, *I fully confess, thankfully acknowledge the justice of Thy doings*].—This thanksgiving refers equally to both the facts mentioned in the last clauses of the verse, to the ἀπέκρυψας and the ἀπεκάλυψας. "These are the two aspects of one and the same dealing on the part of God, the necessity of which Christ recognized (comp. John ix. 39). Meyer. Some critics (as Kuinoel and others) hold, without good reason, that the first of these two antithetic clauses implies only permission.

O Father, Lord of heaven and earth.—The peculiar form of this address is determined by the idea of His administration. In hardening some and enlightening others, God manifests Himself as absolutely reigning both in heaven and on earth. The term πατήρ precedes κύριος, even as *love* absolute *sovereignty*.

[Observe that Christ does not address the Father as *His* Lord, but as the Lord *of heaven and earth*. We have four more (not two, as Alford says) instances of such a public address of our Saviour to His Father, John xi. 41 (at the grave of Lazarus); xii. 28 (*Father, glorify Thy name*); xvii. 1 (in the sacerdotal prayer); and Luke xxiii. 34 (on the cross: *Father, forgive them*, etc.)—P. S.]

These things, ταῦτα.—From the preceding verses we gather that the expression refers to the principle of the great δυνάμεις, which He had revealed in the cities of Galilee, with special reference to ver. 15 (*He that hath ears to hear, let him hear*). Accordingly, the expression alludes to the evidence of His Divine character as the Messiah and Son of God, derived from His word and works.†

To the wise and prudent.—Applying not merely to the Pharisees and scribes [Meyer], but also to the wise and prudent courtiers of Herod, and to the worldly-wise among the people generally. **Babes,** νήπιοι. Originally, the פְּתָאִים, or those unacquainted with Jewish wisdom; here, the believing followers of Jesus generally, or those whom the Pharisees despised; comp. John vii. 49.

Ver. 26. **For so,** etc.—Gersdorf, Fritzsche, Meyer, suggest that ὅτι should be translated by *that*, as in ver. 25. De Wette defends the common translation, which is more suitable, as the εὐδοκία of the Father forms the ultimate ground of consolation. The former apparent paradox is here resolved. But by translating the particle ὅτι by *that*, the difficulty would only be increased, and the whole stress would be laid on the authority of the preceding ναί of Christ. Comp. iii. 17; Luke ii. 14, etc.

Ver. 27. **All things are delivered unto Me.**—Grotius, Kuinoel, and others, apply this exclusively to the doctrine of Christ. De Wette refers it to His rule over men, as in John xiii. 3; Matt. xxviii. 18. But Meyer rightly takes it in an absolute sense, as meaning that everything was committed to His government by the Father. This, however, does not imply that the rule of the Father had ceased, but that all things were by the Father brought into connection with, and subordination to, the economy instituted by Christ. His preaching of the gospel in Galilee had led to a twofold and contrary result. The salvation and the judgment initiated by it in that district were a pledge that the same results would follow in κόσμος generally. The main point lies in the idea, that not the saved only, but also the lost, are His. Their rejection of Christ might seem as if it arrested His arm and baffled His omnipotence. But even their unbelief becomes the occasion for a display of the full consciousness of His royal power. They also who rejected Him are subject to His power. Thus the gospel of Christ is absolute in its effects, and this fact is here clearly and pointedly brought out.

And no man knoweth.—Ἐπιγινώσκειν means more than the simple γινώσκειν. The difference (to which Meyer rightly adverts) is similar to that between the words *cognition* (*Erkenntniss*) and *knowledge* (*Kenntniss*). Tholuck (*Credibility of the Gospel History*, against Strauss) has called attention to the affinity between this verse and the general import of the Gospel of John. In this respect, it may serve as an indirect evidence of the credibility of the Gospel according to John.*—*Connection with the preceding context:* The unlimited and unique cognition of Christ is connected with His unlimited and unique power. *Connection with the succeeding context:* The consequence of His infinite power, and of His infinite cognition of the Father, are his ability and willingness to save to the uttermost all that come unto God by Him.

Ver. 28. [**Come unto Me, all,** etc.—This is the great and final answer to the question of John, xi. 3: "Art Thou He that should come, or shall we wait for another?" No mere man could have spoken these words. Alford.]

All ye that labor, κοπιῶντες καὶ πεφορτισμένοι [**the laboring and the burdened**].—The first of these verbs refers to the idea of laboring and struggling, rather than to that of being wearied and faint. Both expressions refer to the burden of labor, only viewed from different aspects: 1. As voluntary, and undertaken by themselves; 2. as laid upon them by others. [The active and pas-

* [Alford: "The whole ascription of praise is an *answer;* an answer to the mysterious dispensations of God's providence above recounted." Unsatisfactory.—P. S.]

† [Differently Alford: "ταῦτα, *these mysterious arrangements*, by which the sinner is condemned in his pride and unbelief, the humble and childlike saved, and God justified when He saves and condemns."—P. S.]

* [Alford and D. Brown likewise correctly observe, that "the spirit of this verse, and its form of expression," are truly Johannean. We have here a connecting link between the synoptists and John, and an incidental testimony of Matthew to the originality and credibility of the weighty discourses of Christ concerning His relation to the Father, which are only recorded in the fourth Gospel. Although the fourth Gospel may with the church fathers be emphatically called *spiritual* (πνευματικόν), and the synoptical Gospels *corporeal* (σωματικά), the difference is only relative, since John represents the real, incarnate, historical Christ, and the synoptists, especially in this passage and the corresponding section of Luke (x. 21, 22), rise to the pure height of the spirituality and sublimity of John. The bearing of this striking resemblance against Strauss, Baur, and all who deny the genuineness of the Gospel of John, must be apparent to every unprejudiced mind.—P. S.]

sive sides of human misery.] Both these remarks applied to the legal efforts of the Jews. Only those, however, who felt the spiritual import of the law of God realized the existence of such a burden. Accordingly, the expression is nearly akin to poverty in spirit. The law itself was a sufficient burden; add to this what was imposed by the traditions of the Pharisees and scribes (Matt. xxiii. 4). Hence, in general, those laboring under a sense of sin.

And I, κἀγώ.—Emphatically, in opposition to the teachers who laid those burdens on them.

Ver. 29. **My yoke.**—"Allusion to the *yoke* of the law; a name commonly given to it by the Jews (Wetstein). Without any reference to the yoke which Christ Himself bore, or to His cross (Olshausen)." De Wette.—That is to say, it primarily refers not to the cross of Christ, but to His rule, doctrine, and leadership; which, however, also implies the bearing of His cross. The emphasis must be laid on the call, to learn of Him, in opposition to the legal teaching and the burden imposed by the Pharisees. This applies also to what follows.

For I am meek and lowly in heart.—In opposition to the meek and lowly appearance assumed by the scribes.* These qualities were the reason why they should learn of Him, not the subject to be learned. They are, in the first place, to seek from Him *rest for their souls*, ἀνάπαυσιν, מַרְגּוֹעַ, Jer. vi. 16,—the final aim of all religious aspirations.

[Alford: Our Lord does not promise freedom from toil or burden, but *rest in the soul*, which shall make all yokes easy, and all burdens light. The main invitation, however, is to those burdened with the yoke of sin, and of the law, which was added because of sin. Owing to our continued conflict with sin and evil in this world, the ἀνάπαυσις of Christ is still a yoke and a burden, but a light one. Comp. 2 Cor. iv. 16, 17. The rest and joy of the Christian soul is to become *like Christ*.—P. S.]

Ver. 30. **For My yoke is good.**—Χρηστός, when applied to persons, *kindly;* here, *good, beneficent.* Meyer: *salutary*, or *bringing safety.* [Augustine, in one of his sermons, beautifully compares the yoke of Christ to a bird's plumage, an easy weight which enables it to soar to the sky: "*Hæc sarcina non est pondus onerati, sed ala volaturi.*"—P. S.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The spiritual elevation of the soul † of Jesus appears in all its glory from the passage before us. From a denunciation of the cities of Galilee, He passes to a solemn thanksgiving to the Father, and to a declaration of His majesty. In other words, from a deep sense of the dishonor cast upon Him by this generation, He turns in full and blessed consciousness of His exaltation far above all humanity, and the world. Similar transitions from sorrow to joy appear at His last passover, in Gethsemane, and on Golgotha. On the other hand, there is a transition from highest joy to deepest sorrow in His utterances in the temple, when the Greeks desired to see Him, at His triumphal entry into Jerusalem over the Mount of Olives, and in that awful conflict in Gethsemane which followed on His intercessory prayer. In these solemn transactions the divinity of Christ was, so to speak, reflected in the mirror of His human soul, and the eternal Spirit of God in the eagle-like ascension and descension of His feelings.

2. Christ displayed, on this occasion, must fully the sense of His royal dignity, which, indeed, seems to have been specially evoked by the rejection of the world. Even in the case of great and truly humble men, reviling and ill-treatment evoke the native sense of dignity and power. Comp. the history of Paul and of Luther. But Christ could in perfect truthfulness first pronounce a woe upon the cities of Galilee, then declare His own superiority over all, and finally add, "*I am meek and lowly in heart.*"

3. *No one knoweth the Son.*—There is an absolute and unique mystery of spiritual community, both in reference to power and to knowledge, between the Father and the Son. Thence we also infer the spiritual community of their nature, or co-equality of essence. But, as formerly the hiding and revealing of these things had been ascribed to the Father, so it is now assigned to the Son. It is the province of Christology to define the co-operation of the two Persons of the Trinity in these acts. The Father executes the decree according to the calling of the Son, and the Son the calling according to the decree of the Father.

4. *Come unto Me.*—One of the most precious gospel invitations to salvation in the New Testament. The call is addressed to those who labor and are burdened, fatigued and worn out. The promise is that of rest to the soul; its condition, to take upon ourselves the gentle yoke of Christ, in opposition to the unbearable yoke of the law and traditions. Christianity, therefore, has also its yoke, and demands obedience to the supremacy of the word of Christ and the discipline of His Spirit. Nor is the burden wanting which ultimately constitutes our cross. But the yoke is good and beneficial, and the burden easy (ἐλαφρός, related to ἔλαφος, *light as a roe*). This burden, which is to be drawn or borne in the yoke, becomes a lever, and ever raises him who bears it higher and higher.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The humiliation and exaltation in the consciousness of Christ, a sign of His external humiliation and exaltation.—The deepest sorrows of Christians must be transformed into highest praise.—Every affliction becomes transfigured by the gracious purpose of the Father, who rules sovereignly in heaven and on earth.—Even judgment.—Love is enthroned above righteousness, because it is *holy* love.—The judgments of God always go hand in hand with His deliverances; the hiding with the revealing.—What serves to form and open heaven to believers, forms and opens hell to unbelievers.—The great Divine mystery, ignorance of which turns the wise and the prudent into fools, while it imparts knowledge and experience to babes.—Self-confident wisdom closes against us the heaven of revelation, while humble

* [The word καρδία is only here used of Christ. There is, as Olshausen suggests, an essential difference between HUMILITY OF HEART, which Christ possessed in the highest degree from *free* choice and condescending *love* and *compassion*, and POVERTY OF SPIRIT (Matt. v. 3) which cannot be predicated of Him, but only of penitent *sinners* conscious of their unworthiness and longing for salvation. Compare the rich remarks of Olshausen on this whole passage, for the elucidation of which his genial, lovely, gentle spirit peculiarly fitted him (in Kendrick's revised translation, vol. i., p. 484–487). But Lange has gone still deeper in the doctrinal reflections and homiletical hints which follow.—P. S.]

† [An imperfect rendering of *religiöse Schwungkraft des Gemüths.*—P. S.]

longing after truth opens it.*—Spiritual self-elevation in its varied manifestations: 1. It assumes different *forms* (wisdom, righteousness, strength), but is the same in spirit (closed against the influence of Divine grace); 2. different *effects* (loss of revelation, of reconciliation, of salvation), but its ultimate destruction is the same.—Christ manifesting the sense of His royal dignity amid the contempt and rejection of the world.—How the Redeemer anticipated His advent as Judge.—The omnipotence of Christ appearing amid His seeming impotence.—The unique knowledge of Christ: the source of all revelation to the world. — Connection between the power and the knowledge of Christ: 1. In His Divine person; 2. in His work; 3. in the life of His people.—How the Father draws us to the Son, John vi. 44, and the Son reveals to us the Father.—*Come unto Me;* or, the invitation of Jesus: 1. On what it is based; 2. to whom it is addressed; 3. what it demands; 4. what it promises.—Rest of soul the promise of Christ.—The yoke and the burden of Christ as compared with other yokes and burdens (of the law, the world, etc.).—Relationship between the yoke and the burden: 1. The difference; 2. the connection; 3. the unity.—Anyhow, we are put into harness in this life; but we have our choice of the yoke and of the burden.—The gospel ever new to those who labor and are heavy laden.—Christ the aim and goal of all genuine labor of soul.—Christ the Rest of souls: 1. Their sabbath, or rest from the labor of their calling; 2. their sabbath, or rest from the labor of the law; 3. their resurrection day from the labor of death.—Christ gives rest to the soul by revealing the Father.

Starke:—God claims honor and praise, both in respect of His justice upon those who harden themselves, and of His mercy toward the small band of His believing people, 1 Cor. i. 26.—What the wisdom of God demands at our hands.—*Quesnel:* Let us adore with fear and trembling the holy government of God, in the way in which He dispenses His gifts. No man cometh to the Father but through Christ, John xiv. 6.—*Cramer:* Every search after rest or joy is vain without Christ.—The promises of the gospel are general; he alone is excluded who excludes himself.—*Zeisius:* There is no burden in the world more heavy than that of sin on the conscience.—Christ the Teacher in word and deed.—Let us learn meekness and humility in the school of Christ.—*Quesnel:* What Christ bestows, sweetens every affliction in the world.

Heubner:—Both the Christian faith and the Christian life are summed up in this: "revealed by God."—Luther: We cannot instruct the heart.—God alone is its Teacher.—He that knoweth the Son knoweth the Father also, and *vice versâ*.

[Augustine: *Tu nos fecisti ad Te, et cor nostrum inquietum est donec requiescat in Te.* This famous sentence from the *Confessions* may also be so modified: Man is made for Christ, and his heart is without rest, until it rest in Him.—Christ's invitation welcomes us back to the bosom of the Father, that original and proper home of the heart.—Comp. also the practical remarks of Matthew Henry, which are very rich, but too extensive to be transferred here.—P. S.]

* [Compare the lines of Schiller, the best he ever wrote:
"Was kein Verstand der Verständigen sieht,
Das übt [glaubet] in Einfalt ein kindlich Gemüth."—P. S.]

C. CHRIST MANIFESTS HIS ROYAL DIGNITY BY PROVING HIMSELF LORD OF THE SABBATH, LORD OF THE PEOPLE, CONQUEROR AND RULER OF THE KINGDOM OF SATAN, THE FUTURE JUDGE OF HIS OPPONENTS, AND THE FOUNDER OF THE KINGDOM OF LOVE, OR OF THE FAMILY OF THE SAINTS.

CHAPTER XII.

CONTENTS:—The two Sabbath-day discussions in Galilee. Project against the life of the Lord, and His consequent retirement, to which many of the people follow Him. Healing of the demoniac who was blind and dumb, and accusation of the Pharisees, that Jesus was in league with the devil. Reply about blasphemy against the Holy Ghost. Hostile demand of a sign from heaven. Jesus rejoins by pointing to the sign of Jonas, and by warning against the demoniac possession with which the synagogue was threatened. Even the mother and brethren of Jesus now become afraid,—the Lord taking occasion from this to refer to His spiritual and royal generation. In all these great conflicts, Christ manifests Himself as sovereign, higher than the temple and the Sabbath, King of His poor people, Conqueror of the kingdom of Satan—as having consecrated Himself unto death in the anticipation of the glory to come, and as foretelling the judgments that were to befall Israel, as Preacher of repentance to Mary and her sons, and as Founder of the holy kingdom of love, far above all worldly apprehensions or measures of prudence.

---

1. *The twofold offence connected with the Sabbath; or, the Lord of the Temple and of the Sabbath.*
CH. XII. 1–14.

(Comp. Mark ii. 23–28; Luke vi. 1–5.)

1 At that time Jesus went on the sabbath day [sabbath] through the corn [grain-
fields];[1] and his disciples were a hungered [were hungry, or hungered],[2] and began to

2 pluck the ears of corn [ears of grain], and to eat. But when the Pharisees saw *it*, they
said unto him, Behold, thy disciples do that which is not lawful to do upon the sabbath
3 day [sabbath]. But he said unto them, Have ye not read what David did, when he
4 was a hungered [was hungry, or hungered], and they that were with him; How he en-
tered into the house of God, and did eat the shewbread [**the sacred bread of the altar**],
which was not lawful for him to eat, neither [nor] for them which were with him, but
5 only for the priests? Or have ye not read in the law, how that on the sabbath days
6 the priests in the temple profane the sabbath, and are blameless? But I say unto you,
7 That in this place [here] is *one* greater [a greater][3] than the temple. But if ye had
known what *this* meaneth, I will have mercy, and not sacrifice, ye would not have con-
8 demned the guiltless [blameless]. For the Son of man is Lord even[4] of the sabbath
day [sabbath].

(**Comp. Mark iii. 2–6; Luke vi. 6–21.**)

9, 10 And when he was departed thence, he went into their synagogue: And, behold,
there was a man which had *his* hand[5] withered. And they asked him, saying, Is it
11 lawful to heal on the sabbath days [sabbath]? that they might accuse him. And he
said unto them, What man shall there be among you, that shall have one sheep, and if
it fall into a pit on the sabbath day [sabbath], will he not lay hold on it, and lift *it*
12 out? How much then is a man better than a sheep? Wherefore it is lawful to do
13 well on the sabbath days [sabbath]. Then saith he to the man, Stretch forth thine
14 hand. And he stretched *it* forth; and it was restored whole, like as the other. Then
the Pharisees went out, and held a council against him, how they might destroy him.

[1] Ver. 1.—[Lange: *Getreidefeld;* Luther: *Saat;* van Ess: *Saatfeld.* The Greek τὰ σπόριμα from σπείρω means *sown fields, grain-fields, corn-fields.* In the parallel passages, Mark ii. 23 and Luke vi. 1, the word is translated in the E. V.: *corn-fields.*—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 1.—[Comp. iv. 2, and the crit. note p. 80.]

[3] Ver. 6.—Codd. B., D., K., M., etc., [also Cod. Sinaiticus] read the neuter μεῖζον, which is therefore better authenticated than the received reading μείζων. [Lange translates: *ein Höheres als der Tempel ist hier—something higher*, or *a greater thing, than the temple is here.* Alford and Wordsworth also read μεῖζον, which sustains the parallel better. Comp. ii. 19.—P. S.]

[4] Ver. 8.—The καί (*even*) before τοῦ σαββάτου is wanting in the best authorities [also in Cod. Sinait.], and seems to be borrowed from the parallel passages of Mark and Luke.

[5] Ver. 10.—The words of the *text. rec.:* ἦν τὴν before χεῖρα are wanting in B., C., etc., [Cod. Sinait.], and hence doubtful.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Chronological Order.—The journey of Christ through the cities of Galilee—during which He had sent forth His disciples as Apostles, and received the embassy of the Baptist—had closed with His appearance in Jerusalem at the festival of Purim in the year 782 (John v.). The cure which He performed on the Sabbath-day at the pool of Bethesda led the Sanhedrim to determine upon His death. This may be regarded as the turning-point in the history of His public ministry, when the enthusiastic reception He had at first met gave place to continuous persecutions. Henceforth His journeys resembled almost a perpetual flight. From the festival of Purim, Jesus retired into Galilee (John vi. 1). When in the vicinity of Tiberias, He learned that the Baptist had in the interval been executed (comp. John vi. 1–21 with Matt. xiv.; also Mark vi. 14–56; Luke ix. 7–17). The Apostles now returned from their embassy. Jesus withdrew from the overtures of Herod to the eastern shore of the lake. First miraculous feeding. Jesus walking on the sea. The manna from heaven, John vi. 22–71. The Easter festival of the year of the persecution (John vi. 4). During this feast, Jesus probably came to Bethany, but not to Jerusalem (*see* Luke x. 38). Immediately after that, the events occurred which are related in the text. The charge, that Jesus desecrated the Sabbath, followed Him from Jerusalem to Galilee, whither the Sanhedrim and the synagogue sent their spies.

Ver. 1. **On the sabbath.**—Luke designates this sabbath by the term δευτερόπρωτον. The expression probably refers to the first sabbath of the second festive cycle in the Jewish year. It was probably the first sabbath after the Passover of the year 782.

And began to pluck ears of grain.—The plucking of ears of grain was in itself no crime. According to Deut. xxiii. 25, it was allowed when prompted by the cravings of hunger. The same custom still prevails in Palestine. Robinson, i. 493, 499.—But the Pharisees fastened upon the circumstance that this was done on the sabbath, in order to charge the conduct of the disciples against their Master, as a breach of the fourth commandment They had evidently received their instructions from Jerusalem, where Jesus had healed the sick man at the pool of Bethesda. His death had been determined upon; and these Pharisees only acted as overzealous spies. Whenever the disciples commenced to pluck ears of grain (ἤρξαντο), they immediately brought forward their charge. "Traditionalism applied the law of sabbath-observance to all harvest work, among which plucking of ears of grain was also included. Maimonides, *Shabb.* 8; Lightfoot, and Schöttgen." Meyer. The only exception was in the case of famine.

Ver. 3. **Have ye not read?** 1 Sam. xxi.

Ver. 4. **He entered into the house of God,**—*i. e.*, into the tabernacle at Nob.—The twelve loaves of **shew-bread,** לֶחֶם הַפָּנִים, were not intended as an offering to Jehovah, but symbolized the communion of Jehovah with the priesthood. Accordingly, like the Passover lamb, they were a type of the Lord's Supper. The candlestick in the temple symbolized the light which Jehovah shed on men through His chosen instruments; the altar of incense, prayer, by which men dedicated themselves to Jehovah; the golden table with the shew-bread, the communion and fellowship of God with man. The basis of all these symbolical ordinances was the altar of sacrifice in the court, and the sprinkling with blood in the temple. The shew-bread was changed every week, and that which was removed from the temple given to the priests. David was the great model of Jewish piety; and yet he went into the house of God, contrary to the commandment, and ate of the consecrated bread.

Ver. 5. **The priests in the temple profane the sabbath,** Num. xxviii. 9;—*i. e.*, break the outward and general regulations for the sabbath.—Not merely: "consistently with your traditions" (Meyer). This would apply merely to the expression, to *break*, or *profane*. The conditional character of the sabbatic law appeared from this, that the enjoyment of the sabbath by the people depended on the regular functions of the sacred priesthood on that day. The first instance adduced required to be supplemented. It only confirmed the lawfulness of similar conduct in case of famine, but not that of doing something on the sabbath which resembled labor. The latter is vindicated by the second example.

Ver. 6. **A greater** (**a greater thing,** μεῖζον, stronger than μείζων*) **than the temple is here.**—Comp. 1 John ii. 19. The reasoning is as follows: The necessary duties of the temple-service authorize the servants of the temple, the priests, to break the order of the sabbath [according to your false understanding of sabbath profanation]; how much more can He, who is the real temple of God on earth, far elevated above the symbolical temple, authorize His disciples to break the order of the sabbath [as ye call it], in case of necessity. A conclusion *a minori ad majus*. The whole deportment of the disciples was a continuous service in the temple.

Ver. 7. **But if ye had known.**—Having defended Himself against their attacks, He now turns round upon His opponents. Once more He recalls to their minds the passage in Hosea vi. 6; this time applying it to them individually. Had they not just insisted upon sacrifice, instead of that mercy which those who were an hungered might claim at their hands?

Ver. 8. **For the Son of Man is Lord.**—The emphasis rests on the word **Lord,** which accordingly is placed first in the original.† The γάρ confirms the judgment, that the disciples were blameless. The Son of Man is **Lord of the Sabbath.**—As being Himself the *Divine Rest* and the *Divine Celebration*,‡ He is both the principle and the object of the sabbath; He rests in God, and God in Him: hence He is the Mediator of proper sabbath-observance, and the Interpreter of the sabbath law. Even the Jews admitted that the authority of the Messiah was greater than that of the laws of the sabbath. (Berthold, *Christol.* p. 162 sq.) As the opponents of the Lord now directly attacked His Messianic dignity, He was constrained to meet them on their own ground. They could not but understand the expression, "*Son of Man*," in this connection, as referring to the Messiah. Still, it was not His last and official confession. Hence the Pharisees soon afterward tempted Him, asking a sign from heaven. The expression, "*Son of Man*," then, refers not to the general right of man in connection with the sabbath (Grotius, Clericus, etc.). Still, it is peculiarly suitable in this connection, especially when taken along with the introductory remark recorded by Mark: *for the sabbath has been made for man, not man for the sabbath.**

[ALFORD: "Since the sabbath was an ordinance instituted for the use and benefit of man,—the Son of Man, who has taken upon Him full and complete Manhood, the great representative and Head of humanity, has this institution under His own power." WORDSWORTH: "He calls Himself *the Lord of the sabbath*—a prophetic intimation cleared up by the event, that the law of the sabbath would be changed, as it has now been under the gospel, not by any alteration in the *proportion* of time due to God, but in the position of the day; by the transfer of it from the seventh day of the week to the first, in memory of the resurrection of the *Son of Man*." D. BROWN: "In what sense now is the Son of Man Lord of the sabbath-day? Not surely to abolish it—that surely were a strange lordship, especially just after saying that it was made or instituted (ἐγένετο) for MAN—but to *own* it, to *interpret* it, to *preside over* it, and to *ennoble* it, by merging it in 'the Lord's Day' (Rev. i. 10), breathing into it an air of liberty and love necessarily unknown before, and thus making it the nearest resemblance to the eternal sabbathism."—P. S.]

Ver. 9. **And when He had departed thence.**—Luke relates that He had come into the synagogue on another sabbath, probably on that which followed this event. Meyer interprets the μεταβὰς ἐκεῖθεν as meaning, on the same sabbath, and insists that there is a divergence between the accounts of Matthew and Luke. We only see an absence of details in Matthew, while all the circumstances warrant us in supposing that this Evangelist also meant the following sabbath. This view is strengthened by the mention of the change of place, of the lapse of time, and by the circumstance, that Matthew relates how they had laid a regular plan to entrap Him.

Into their synagogue,—*i. e.*, the synagogue of these very opponents. The place in Galilee is not mentioned; but from the manifest authority of

* [Comp. also πλεῖον Ἰωνᾶ and πλεῖον Σολομῶνος in ch. xii. 41, 42.—P. S.]

† [In German the exact order of the Greek: κύριος γάρ ἐστι τοῦ σαββάτου ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, can be retained, as in Lange's version: *Denn Herr des Sabbats ist der Menschensohn.*—P. S.]

‡ [Germ.: *die persönliche Gottesruhe, Gottesfeier*, the personal embodiment or incarnation of the rest and worship of God.—P. S.]

* [Mark ii. 27. A great principle which must regulate the whole sabbath question, and settles both the permanent necessity of the sabbath for the temporal and eternal welfare of man, and the true Christian freedom in its observance. So the family is made for man, *i. e.*, for the benefit of man, and therefore a most benevolent institution, a gracious gift of God. Government is made for man, *i. e.*, it is not an end, but a necessary and indispensable means for the protection, development, well-being and happiness of man. If the means be turned into an end, the benefit is lost. I have given my views on the sabbath-question and the merits of the Anglo-American theory and practice as compared with the Continental European, in a little book published by the Am. Tract Society, New York, 1864.—P. S.]

His antagonists, we infer that it must have been one of the principal cities. From Mark ii. 6, we might suppose that it had been Tiberias, as the Herodian court-party appeared at the time among His opponents. But we do not read that Jesus had at any period been at Tiberias. Meyer suggests that the scene is laid at Capernaum.

Ver. 10. **A man with a withered hand.**—Comp. 1 Kings xiii. 4. Probably it was not merely paralyzed in its sinews, but dried up and shrivelled. Comp. Mark and Luke. This person appears to have been an involuntary and unsuspecting instrument of their malice. He is introduced by the Evangelist in the words καὶ ἰδού. "According to traditionalism, healing was prohibited on the sabbath, excepting in cases where life was in danger." Meyer, referring to Wetstein and Schöttgen *in loc.* But it is improbable that this tradition was already settled at that time. The instance adduced by Christ, "*What man shall there be among you?*" etc., speaks against it. For later traditions also laid down the ordinance, that if a beast fell on the sabbath into a pit, or reservoir for water, it was only lawful to give it necessary food, or straw to lie upon, [or to lay planks] by which it might perhaps also be enabled to come out of the pit. (Maimon. *in Shabbath.* Sepp, *Life of Christ*, ii. 333.)—Jerome quotes from the Gospel of the Nazarenes, to the effect that the man with the withered hand had been a stonecutter, who entreated Jesus to heal him, that he might no longer be obliged to beg his bread.

Is it lawful?—Properly, *if* it is lawful; although the εἰ in the New Testament and in the Sept. frequently follows upon direct queries. Still, it indicates doubt or temptation. Meyer supplements mentally, "I should like to know whether." The meaning of the εἰ would be still stronger, if, while anxious to induce the Lord to heal the man, they had left Him to draw the formal inference. If it is lawful then—(here stands the poor man). Mark and Luke relate how the Pharisees lay in wait for Him.

That they might accuse Him.—Viz., before the local tribunal of the synagogue (ch. v. 21), where, as appears from the context, they were the judges. But they expected not merely an answer which would enable them to accuse Him of teaching a violation of the Sabbath, but also an outward act, which they might charge against Him as an actual breach of the fourth commandment.

Ver. 11. **What man is there among you?**—The construction as in Matt. vii. 9. Luke introduces this on another occasion in xiii. 10, and xiv. 5.

Ver. 13. **And he stretched it forth.**—By this act the restored man defied the authority of the Pharisees, and acknowledged that of Christ. Hence it was a signal manifestation of faith, even as the cure, in the midst of such contradiction, was an instance of special power. To stretch forth his hand, was to have it restored.

Ver. 14. **And held a council.**—A formal heresy-suit was to be immediately instituted. According to Mark, they combined for this purpose with the Herodian court-party, which had probably been offended by the recent refusal of Jesus to meet Herod, Luke ix. 9. Thus neither the clear arguments of Jesus had convinced them of their error, nor His gracious manifestation awakened in their breast aught but feelings of bitterness. Their murderous purpose was still further stimulated by the admiration of the people, who followed Him in large numbers.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. Among the offences which the Pharisees took against the work and teaching of the Lord, that of breaking the sabbath stood only next in importance to the unnamed, yet chief stumblingblock in their minds, that He would not be a Messiah according to their own ideas (John i. 29; comp. Matt. iv.; John ix. 30, 31; x. 24). Christ first excited the attention and suspicion of the Jews by His cleansing the temple (John ii. 13). What He had said upon that occasion about breaking down the temple, they had perverted and stored up against Him. Henceforth they were filled with suspicion, and narrowly watched Him (John iv. 1). Then followed the offence connected with his intercourse with publicans (Matt. ix.). This was succeeded by His mode of treating their ordinances about the sabbath. His cure of the impotent man at the pool of Bethesda had decided them against Him, when the two events recorded in the text completed the excitement. The charge was in the first place brought against the disciples, and then against their Lord. As formerly in Jerusalem, so now in Galilee, His death was resolved upon. The scene recorded in Luke xiii. 17, which now occurred, probably took place in the country, and hence excited less notice. This was again followed by the second and greatest offence given by Jesus, when He healed the blind man at Jerusalem during the Feast of Tabernacles (John ix.); an offence which was not obviated by the circumstance, that in connection with this miracle, Jesus made use of the pool of Siloam, on the temple-mount.

From all this it appears, that their offence about the sabbath formed the basis and centre of all their other accusations against Jesus. In view of this, His miracles were represented as resulting from fellowship with Satan; His claim to the Messiahship, as an arrogation of the prophetic office, and a seduction of the people; and His taking the name of "Son of God," as blasphemy. Objections of less weight, and an interminable catalogue of calumnies, were connected with these charges. But the real stumblingblock of the Pharisees, was that conflict between the spirit and the dead letter, between the gospel and traditionalism, between salvation and unbelief, righteousness and hypocrisy, and holiness and proud self-seeking, which Christ represented and embodied. —It is a striking fact, that the pharisaical hierarchy which had charged the Lord with desecrating the sabbath, was obliged to hold a council on the great Easter-sabbath, to run into the heathen and unclean house of the Gentile Pilate, and then to seal the stone over the tomb of Jesus in the unclean place of a skull.

2. Christ is Lord of the sabbath in the Church and in believers; and the statement, that the sabbath is made for man, is surely all the more applicable to the Lord's Day. Viewing the fourth commandment as enjoining a day of festive rest, it is as much binding on the Christian Church and on civil society as any other of the ten commandments. But in its true meaning, the Jewish sabbath law was a Divine law of humanity and of protection for man and even for beast ("thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger"), and prepared for the Christian sabbath in the highest sense; which is much more than a law or outward ordinance, it is a Divine-human institution, a new creation and a life in the Spirit. According to this standard, we may test

our mode of sabbath-observance, whether or not it correspond to the mind of Christ, and to the spiritual import of His resurrection-day. Every urgent necessity must at once put an end to the outward ordinance; and to discharge such duties, is to establish, not to invalidate, the right observance of the sabbath. Works of necessity are conditioned by compassion and mercy. *Christ is Lord of the sabbath, being Himself the personal sabbath: all that leads to Him, and is done in Him, is sabbath observance; all that leads from Him, is sabbath-breaking.* Therefore let it be ours to oppose every desecration of the sabbath, in every form and in every sense.*

3. In strict consistency with the view of the Pharisees, who represented the disciples as having done what amounted to harvest labor, it might have been argued, that the priests were engaged on the sabbath in the occupation of butchers and bakers, and this in the temple itself. But what should be said of the Christian minister who would condemn works of necessity and mercy? "The sacrificial services, and the ceremonial law generally, were designed to be subservient to the highest law of love, 1 Sam. xv. 22; Psa. l. 8-14; li. 18; Hos. vi. 6; Matt. ix. 13." Gerlach. Comp. also Isa. i. 13, 14; lxvi. 2, 3, etc.

4. Christ spares the representatives of traditionalism even while resisting them: He heals the man with the withered hand, *merely by His word*, not by touching him, nor by taking hold of his hand.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Traditionalism denouncing the Lord as a heretic: 1. The narrative; 2. its eternal import.—How the spirit of traditionalism perverts false worship into antagonism to genuine worship.—The outward ordinances of the sabbath perverted into antagonism to the spiritual principle of the sabbath.—Genuine sabbath-observance.—How does it manifest itself? 1. By the removal of the sabbath interruptions caused by misery and want; 2. in works of mercy and compassion; 3. by transforming the work of the week into spiritual labor and labor of love.—Vers. 1-8: Works of necessity.—True and spurious works of necessity.—Vers. 9-14: Works of love.—True and spurious works of love.—How the teaching, institutions, and history of the Old Testament themselves supply a spiritual interpretation of the letter, vers. 1-8.—How the conduct of legal zealots testifies against their traditions, vers. 9-14.—How hypocrites care more for their ceremonies than for their cattle, and more for their cattle than for their suffering brethren.—We are to be compassionate even to animals.—Even animals should have a share in our festive days.—Christ victorious over His opponents.—Christ the true temple.—Christ the Lord of the sabbath.—Christ leading us to true sabbath-observance.—Sabbath-breaking and desecration of the temple, as appearing in the conduct of the enemies of the Lord when condemning Him to death for an alleged breach of the fourth commandment.—Object of the Lord's Day, and object of Christian worship.—To convert these means into the object, is to destroy the object itself.—How self-righteous traditionalism hardens itself amidst the most glorious manifestations of Christ.—The Lord's Day either the most blessed season of spiritual rest, or the most dreary workday.—The Church either the most blessed place of rest, or the most dreary workhouse.—Explanation of the fourth commandment by the life and teaching of the Lord.

Starke:—Vers. 1-8. *Quesnel*:—It is better to suffer want with Christ than to indulge in earthly luxury.—The preservation of man is more important than any outward ordinance.—*Hedinger*: Let us remember the glorious liberty of Christianity, which should not be readily surrendered for the yoke of outward ceremonies, Col. ii. 16-20.—It is the common practice of hypocrites to make of trifles a matter of conscience and a sin, while at the same time they are not afraid to commit grievous sins against God.—Those who have zeal without knowledge must be reproved by the word of God.—Works of mercy, of necessity, and for the glory of God are not prohibited on the sabbath day; but let us take care not to make a case of necessity where there is none.—*Osiander*: Necessity dispenses from observance of the ceremonial law, but not from that of the ten commandments.—True sabbath-observance: rest of the soul from sinful lusts, and dedication of the heart to God.—The Lord of the temple must be sought in the temple.—The real character of all works and pretences to piety should be ascertained.—A diligent exercise of genuine love the most acceptable worship, James i. 27.—Vers. 9-14: Persecution must not deter the servant of God from continuing his work.—*Zeisius*: Following the example of Christ, we should rejoice in frequenting meetings for religious exercises.—*Majus*: It is worse than ungodliness to go into the house of God only in order to spy, to lay snares, and to find vent for our malice.—*Cramer*: The godly are always engaged in a controversy with the world; but at length, they invariably obtain the victory.—*Osiander*: We must do good to our neighbor, even though we should be evil spoken of on that account by wicked men.—A pair of strong working arms is a great blessing from God.—Determined and wilful enemies of the truth are beyond recovery.—2 Tim. iii. 13.

Lisco:—The Pharisees misunderstood the object of the ceremonial law, which was to support and to strengthen the moral law.—The Lord shows by the example of David, that not the letter, but the spirit, of the law was of importance.—Our whole life should be a sabbath devoted to the Lord, a type of the eternal sabbath in the world to come.

Heubner: The disciples were poor; but they preferred to suffer hunger with Christ, rather than enjoy affluence without Him.—Hypocrites are always the most censorious.—Genuine love and esteem for man are the best interpreters of the law.

[*Dr. Brown*:—How miserable a thing is a slavish adherence to the letter of the Scripture, which usually, the closer it is, occasions only a wider departure from its spirit.—*Wordsworth*:—In the sabbath of eternity we shall rest from evil, but doing good will be our sabbath itself.—P. S.]

* [Dr. J. P. Lange, the author of this Commentary, composed a beautiful hymn on the Sabbath of which I will quote the first stanza:

"*Stiller, heil'ger Sabbathtag,*
Wie ein hehrer Glockenschlag
Aus dem Dom der Ewigkeit
Tönst du durch's Gewirr der Zeit,
Dass der Mensch aus dem Gewühle
Seiner Werke zum Gefühle
Seines ew'gen Wesens komme
Und bedenke, was ihm fromme."—P. S.]

2. *Royal administration of Christ among the people in His retirement.* CH. XII. 15–21.

15 But when Jesus knew *it*, he withdrew himself[1] from thence: and great multitudes
16 [many][2] followed him, and he healed them all; And charged them that they should
17 not make him known: That it might be fulfilled[3] which was spoken by Esaias
18 [Isaiah] the prophet, saying, "Behold my servant [son],[4] whom I have chosen;
my beloved, in whom my soul is well pleased: I will put my Spirit upon him, and
19 he shall shew [announce] judgment to the Gentiles. He shall not strive, nor cry;
20 neither shall any man hear his voice in the streets. A bruised reed shall he not break,
21 and smoking flax shall he not quench, till he send forth judgment unto victory. And
in his name[5] shall the Gentiles trust" (Isa. xlii. 1–3).

[1] Ver. 15.—['Ιησ. γνοὺς ἀνεχώρησεν: "*Jesus knowing*" it, *i. e.* (as Lange inserts in the text in small type), that they sought to destroy His life, "*withdrew Himself*."—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 15.—Lachmann, on the authority of Cod. B. and the Latin Vulgate, omits ὄχλοι. The omission was probably exegetical, to avoid the appearance of exaggeration in what follows. [Cod. Sinait. sustains Lachmann and, like the Vatican Cod., in Mai's and in Buttmann's edition, reads simply πολλοί.—P. S.]

[3] Ver. 17.—[This is the proper transl. of ἵνα (or ὅπως) πληρωθῇ. Not: *and thus was fulfilled*, as Webster and Wilkinson *in loc.* explain, which is superficial and ungrammatical. Ἵνα is not to be taken ἐκβατικῶς, but τελικῶς; it signifies not simply the result, but the divine purpose and aim. Comp. Meyer on Matt. i. 23, and Lange in the Exeg. note on xii. 17.—P. S.]

[4] Ver. 18.—[The Lord (as also the Sept. in the passage alluded to, Isa. xlii. 1) uses the word ὁ παῖς μου, not the more usual ὁ δοῦλος μου, for the Hebrew עַבְדִּי, a significant change, which Dr. Lange overlooks, as he translates: *mein Knecht*. *See* Exeg. note on ver. 17, etc.—P. S.]

[5] Ver. 21.—[*Text. rec.*: ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι. But Lachmann, Tischendorf, Alford, Wordsworth, etc., omit ἐν, on the best critical authorities. Meyer: "ἐν is an addition, as also ἐπί in Euseb. and some minuscule MSS." This is the only case in the N. T. where ἐλπίζειν is constructed with the simple dative, although it is good Greek (comp. Thucyd. iii. 97) and signifies the cause and object of hope. Elsewhere, as in the LXX, the verb is constructed with ἐν, εἰς, or ἐπί.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

General Survey.—The reference of the Evangelist in this section to the more private activity of the Lord, applies to the whole period of His retirement from the persecutions of the Jewish hierarchy. It commenced at the festival of Purim, in 782, and closed with His public appearance on leaving the wilderness of Ephraim, before the Passover of 783. In the interval, He enjoyed only temporary seasons of rest, especially in Peræa. The following took place during this period: (1) The return over the Sea of Galilee to Gaulonitis, on the occasion of His coming to Galilee from the festival of Purim, when he was informed of the execution of John the Baptist (ch. xiv); (2) a quiet journey through the country during the Easter festival, extending probably as far as Bethany, and return to Galilee (chs. xii. and xiii.); (3) a journey from Galilee, through the territory of Tyre and Sidon, and the northern highlands, to the eastern and western shores of the Lake of Gennesareth (ch. xv.); (4) the return from Magdala, and over the lake, to the eastern mountains; (5) a secret journey through Galilee and the country, terminating in His sudden appearance at Jerusalem, at the Feast of Tabernacles, in the year 782 (ch. xvi.; xvii. 1–21); (6) the last appearance of Jesus at Capernaum, and journey to Peræa through the country lying between Samaria and Galilee; (7) the first stay of Jesus in Peræa, and going up to Jerusalem to the Feast of the Dedication of the Temple; (8) the second stay in Peræa, and going to Bethany to raise Lazarus; (9) the retirement of Jesus to the wilderness of Ephraim, under the ban of the Sanhedrim, till the last Easter festival. The statement of the Evangelist refers more particularly to this period, although it applies, in general, to the whole life of Jesus.

Ver. 15. **He healed them all.**—By healing their sick, He restored the people generally. Living connection between the healthy and the diseased.

Ver. 16. **And charged them.**—This does not refer to their keeping the place of His residence secret, but to the duty of reserve in publishing His deeds and dignity as the Messiah. He was desirous of arresting for a time an open rupture between His carnal followers and His enemies.

Ver. 17. **In order that** (ἵνα) **it might be fulfilled,** Isa. xlii. 1.—Freely quoted from the original Hebrew. The expression, עֶבֶד יְהוָֹה, *servant of Jehovah*, in the second portion of the prophecies of Isaiah, must refer to the Messiah. As the idea of a personal Messiah had been clearly expressed in the first portion of these prophecies, the hermeneutical rule here applies, that a biblical doctrine can never pass from a definite to a more indefinite form. The interpretation of the Sept., applying the term to Jacob and Israel, only shows the peculiar Alexandrian tendencies of the translators. Possibly they may have been misled by the expression in Isa. viii. 14, although even there the terms, Jacob and Israel, should be taken in an ideal rather than a literal sense. The Chaldee Paraphrast and Kimchi apply the passage to the Messiah (comp. Isa. xi. 1 sqq.). The prophecy reads as follows: "Behold My servant, whom I *establish* (place firmly); Mine Elect, in whom My soul delighteth: I have put My Spirit upon Him; judgment to the nations (Gentiles) shall He bring. He shall not cry, nor be loud (lift up the voice, strain); and He shall not cause His voice to be heard outside (in the street, outside the camp). A bruised reed shall He not break, and the dimly-burning flax shall He not quench: according to truth (unto truth) shall He manifest (bring forth, complete) judgment. He shall not keep back (being wearied) nor (prematurely) break through (רָצַץ, transitive), till He have planted

judgment on the earth: and the isles (the uttermost ends of the earth) shall wait for His law."—This prophecy, then, is a verbal prediction in the strictest sense.*

Ver. 18. **Judgment.**—Decisive final judgment, John iii. 36.—**To the Gentiles.**—The multitudes which follow the Lord, in disregard of the condemnation of the Pharisees, were an emblem of the Gentiles. [Alford: "In these words the majesty of His future glory as the Judge is contrasted with the meekness to be spoken of: 'And yet He shall not bruise.'" —P. S.]

Ver. 20. **A bruised reed and smoking flax.**—An emblem of the people bowed and broken under the load of traditionalism.† The poor people (or, in general, the poor in spirit, are not to inherit death, despair, and perdition in judgment, but) are to receive from the Lord, both spiritually and physically, a new life.

Till He send forth judgment unto victory [*ἐκβάλῃ εἰς νῖκος τὴν κρίσιν*, *exire jusserit*, cause it to issue in victory, so that no further conflict will remain].—An abbreviation and paraphrase of Isa xlii. 3 (לֶאֱמֶת, etc.) and 4 (עַד־יָשִׂים, etc.). The judgment is to be transformed into a victory of truth, or into an absolute victory. This was implied in the expressions used by the prophet, but is brought out more distinctly in the text of the Evangelist. The word *ἐκβάλῃ* (comp. ix. 38) indicates great power, overcoming all resistance.

Ver. 21. **In His name.**—In the original, לְתוֹרָתוֹ. The Sept. renders it as in Matthew, substituting *name* for *law*.‡ The name of the Messiah implies the principle, the summary of His doctrine. Meyer: "The Gentiles will trust, on the ground of what His name as the Messiah implies." This view is supported by the use of the dative, *τῷ ὀνόματι*.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The breach between the Messiah and His people widens. The King is rejected, and His sufferings approach a crisis. This implied, at the same time, a breach between the enemies and the adherents of Jesus in Israel, which in turn typified that which would ensue between unbelieving Israel and the believing Gentiles.

2. On this occasion, the peculiar manner in which Jesus was to administer His kingly office appeared more clearly than ever before. He might now have manifested Himself as Judge, broken the bruised reed and quenched the smoking flax. But, instead of that, He retired, and adopted a more private mode of working, in anticipation of His full and final sufferings. Accordingly, the Evangelist most aptly applies the prediction of Isaiah to this period of retirement; because, while characteristic of the activity of Jesus generally, it referred specially to this year of persecution.

3. Christ fled *for* His enemies, while He retired *from* them. His was not the flight of fear. He always addressed Himself only to those who were susceptible—*i. e.*, to those who labored and were heavy laden—not to judge, but to save them.—The time for His final sufferings had not yet come; there was still ample room for active work, although of a more private character. On this ground He now retired, and dwelt chiefly with the poor people, among whom also He displayed the greatest number of His miraculous deliverances.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Christ's retirement from His enemies a solemn sign,—1. not of fear or weakness; but, 2. of power, of wisdom, of compassion, and of judgment.—The Lord can never want a Church.—Jesus; or, perfect patience amid an impatient world.—The patience and meekness of Jesus as predicted by the prophets.—Christ the Elect of God.—Christ the Root of the elect.—Patience, endurance, and perseverance, the evidence of election.—The Elect the servant of God. —God's beloved Son His perfect Servant. 1. As Servant, the Redeemer of the world; 2. as Son, the ground and object of the world's redemption.—Christ the true Friend of the people.—Jesus the Saviour of nations.—The patience and meekness of Christ overcoming the world.

Starke:—*Quesnel*: It is good sometimes to remain concealed with Christ, whether it be from humility or from necessity.—Jesus Christ above all the Servant of God, and alone worthy to serve Him.—Oh, how lovable is meekness in the servants of Christ! He who loves strife and debate cannot be His.—*Zeisius*: Christ in the form of a servant, Phil. ii. 7, 8.—Let our courage never fail, truth must prevail.—Christ the hope, not only of Israel, but of the Gentiles.

Gossner:—It is characteristic of the Lord that He quietly proceeded on His way and accomplished His work without noise and commotion. Many *seem* to do a great deal and yet accomplish nothing.—If we hold a smoking flax to the fire, it is easily kindled again.

Heubner:—Where there is even a germ of good, there is still hope.—The bruised reed: a soul bowed down under a sense of sin.—Smoking flax: a soul in which a spark of the Divine life is still left.

* [Dr. Wordsworth calls this quotation, ver. 17-21, a remarkable specimen of the manner in which the Holy Spirit, speaking by the evangelists, deals with the prophecies of the Old Test. in order to interpret them. *Ἵνα* (or *ὅπως*) *πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθέν*, is the form used by the evangelists when this process of divine exposition is performed. It is the title of an evangelical targum or paraphrase. For the Hebrew עַבְדִּי, *my servant*, the Lord does not say *ὁ δοῦλός μου*, *my servant* (as the Septuagint usually translates, though not in *this* passage), but *ὁ παῖς μου*, which admits of a double sense, *servant* and *son* (comp. Acts iii. 13, 26; iv. 27, 30), and suggests the union of the obedience of the servant and the dearness of the son in the person of Christ. In a similar way Wordsworth explains the other modifications of the words of the prophecy here quoted.—P. S.]

† [A proverbial expression for, "He will not crush the contrite heart, nor extinguish the slightest spark of repentant feeling in the sinner." Alford.—P. S.]

‡ [The LXX renders: *ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι*, Matthew, according to the true reading: *τῷ ὀνόματι*, without preposition. Both followed another Hebrew reading: לִשְׁמוֹ for לְתוֹרָתוֹ.—P. S.]

8. ***Miraculous healing of a demoniac, blind and dumb. Blasphemous accusation of the Pharisees, that Jesus was in league with Beelzebub; and reply of Christ about the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost. The Pharisees seek a sign from heaven; but Jesus promises them a sign from the deep, and announces the impending spiritual doom of an apostate and unbelieving race.*** **CH. XII. 22–45.**

(Mark iii. 20–30; Luke xi. 14–26; 29–32.)

22 Then was brought unto him one possessed with a devil, blind, and dumb: and he
healed him, insomuch that [so that, ὥστε] the blind and dumb [1] both spake and saw.
23 And all the people were amazed, and said, Is not this [Is this] [2] the Son of David?
24 But when the Pharisees heard *it*, they said, This *fellow* [*man*] [3] doth not cast out devils,
25 but by Beelzebub [Beelzebul], the prince of the devils. And Jesus knew their
thoughts, and said unto them, Every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desola-
26 tion; and every city or house divided against itself shall not stand: And if Satan cast
[casts] out Satan, he is divided against himself; how shall then his kingdom stand?
27 And if I by Beelzebub [-*l*] cast out devils, by whom do your children cast *them* out?
28 therefore they shall be your judges. But if I cast out devils by the Spirit of God, then
29 the kingdom of God is come unto you [upon you].[4] Or else, how can one enter into a
strong man's [5] house, and spoil [take from him, seize upon his] [6] his goods [instruments,
σκεύη, *i. e.*, here the demoniacs], except he first bind the strong man? and then he will
30 spoil [plunder] his house. He that is not with me is against me; and he that
31 gathereth not with me scattereth abroad. Wherefore I say unto you, All manner of
sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men: but the blasphemy *against* the *Holy*
32 Ghost [of the Spirit] shall not be forgiven unto men. And whosoever speaketh a word
against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him: but whosoever speaketh against the
Holy Ghost [Spirit], it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world [æon], neither
33 in the *world* [that which is] to come. Either make the tree good, and his [its] fruit
good; or else make the tree corrupt, and his [its] fruit corrupt: for the tree is
34 known by *his* [*its*] fruit. O generation of vipers, how can ye, being evil, speak good
35 things? for out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh. A good man out
of the good treasure of the heart [7] bringeth [sendeth] forth good things: and an evil
36 man out of the evil treasure bringeth [sendeth] forth evil things. But I say unto you,
That every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day
37 of judgment. For by thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be
condemned.
38 Then certain of the scribes and of the Pharisees answered [him],[8] saying, Master,
39 we would see a sign from thee. But he answered and said unto them, An evil and
adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given to it, but
40 the sign of the prophet Jonas [Jonah the prophet]: For as Jonas [Jonah] was three
days and three nights in the whale's belly [belly of the great fish]; so shall the Son of
41 man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth. The men of Nineveh
shall rise in [the, ἐν τῇ] judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it: because
[for] [9] they repented at the preaching of Jonas [Jonah]; and, behold, a greater than
42 Jonas [Jonah] *is* here. The queen of the south shall rise up in the judgment with this
generation, and shall condemn it: for she came from the uttermost parts [the ends] of
the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon; and, behold, a greater than Solomon *is* here.
43 When the unclean spirit is gone out of a man, he walketh through dry places, seeking
44 rest, and findeth none. Then he saith, I will return into my house [10] from whence I
45 came out; and when he is come, he findeth *it* empty, swept, and garnished. Then
goeth he, and taketh with himself [him] seven other spirits more wicked than himself,
and they enter in and dwell there: and the last *state* of that man is worse than the
first. Even so shall it be also unto this wicked generation.

[1] Ver. 22.—1. B., D., [Cod. Sinait.], Lachmann, Tischendorf, [Alford]: τὸν κωφόν, [*the dumb*]. 2. L., X., D., Syr.: κωφὸν καὶ τυφλόν, [*dumb and blind*]. 3. Latter Codd., the *text. rec.*, Griesbach, Meyer, [Wordsworth, Stier and Theile, etc.]: τὸν τυφλὸν καὶ κωφόν, [*the blind and dumb*]. We suppose that in the second place κωφός is used in a more general sense, signifying stupidity.

[2] Ver. 23.—[Μήτι οὗτός ἐστιν, etc. Lange, correctly, according to the German idiom: *Ist doch dieser nicht etwa?* Conant and the revised version of the A. B. Union: *Is this*, etc. This is the original rendering of the English Version in

the editions of 1611 and of 1613, in this passage (though not in John iv. 29): *Is this the Son of David?* But most editions, including that of the Am. B. Soc., read: *Is* NOT *this*, etc. A change for the worse. For μήτι or μή, both in the N. T. and in classic Greek, always implies some doubt and the expectation or the wish of a *negative* answer; while οὐ in questions looks to an affirmative answer. Winer, *Grammatik*, 6th ed., p. 453: μή (μήτι) *steht wo eine* VERNEINENDE *Antwort vorausgesetzt oder erwartet wird*, DOCH NICHT? . . . . *Der Fragende legt es immer auf eine negative Antwort an und würde nicht überrascht sein, wenn er eine solche erhielte, John iv. 33; viii. 22; Matt. xii. 23; John iv. 29; vii. 26, 35.*"—P. S.]

[3] Ver. 24.—[*Fellow* implies contempt, which is not warranted by the use of the demonstrative pronoun οὗτος, either here or in the preceding verse. Howard Crosby (The N. T. with explanatory Notes or Scholia): "*Fellow* is an unhappy word to introduce here, although it was not so objectionable when our version was formed. There is no word in the Greek, the pronoun '*this*' standing alone. We may say '*this one*.'"—P. S.]

[4] Ver. 28.—[Ἔφθασεν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς, which the E. V., in the parallel passage Luke xi. 20 renders: the kingdom of God *is come upon you*. Φθάνειν with the Classics means *prævenire*, to precede, anticipate, overtake, and so 1 Thess. iv. 15 (E. V.: "shall not *prevent*—*i. e.*, in the old English sense of *prævenire*—them which are asleep"); but in Hellenistic and in modern Greek it means also *pervenire*, to come near, to come upon, yet often with the idea of surprise, as here. Wesley and Stier: Is already upon you, *i. e.*, before you looked for it.—P. S.]

[5] Ver. 29.—[Lit.: *the strong man's*, τοῦ ἰσχυροῦ, with reference to the particular case in hand, but not: the *strong one*, viz. Satan (Campbell); for the Saviour draws an illustration from common life to show his relation to Satan.—P. S.]

[6] Ver. 29.—[According to the true reading ἁρπάσαι, instead of διαρπάσαι, which occurs in the following verse.—P. S.]

[7] Ver. 35.—The best MSS. [including Cod. Sinait.] omit τῆς καρδίας (*of the heart*), which seems to be an interpretation.

[8] Ver. 38.—The best MSS. [also Cod. Sinait.] add αὐτῷ after ἀπεκρίθησαν.

[9] Ver. 41.—[As ὅτι is correctly translated in the parallel case ver. 42: *for she came*.—P. S.]

[10] Ver. 44.—The best authorities favor the emphatic position of *into my house* at the beginning of the sentence. [The Cod. Sinait. likewise reads: εἰς τὸν οἶκόν μου ἐπιστρέψω. But this does not do as well in English, as in the Greek and German languages.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Chronological Arrangement.—Luke relates these addresses imperfectly, and in another, but apparently more correct, order. This section manifestly describes the close of the public ministry of Jesus in Galilee, and the open breach between the Lord and the pharisaical party in that province, corresponding to the conflict in Jerusalem, related in chs. xxi. and xxiii. Ch. xiv. records a prior event; and the two conflicts in chs. xv. 1 and xvi. 1 form only the conclusion of the contest which was now opening. After the festival of Purim, the pharisaical party in Galilee had received instructions from Jerusalem to persecute the Lord. This behest was obeyed, though in a coarser manner than by the chiefs in Jerusalem. The former private accusation, that Jesus was in league with Satan (ch. ix. 34, comp. x. 25), was now publicly and boldly brought forward. "The resemblance between this occurrence and that recorded in ix. 32, is not owing to the circumstance that different facts are mixed up (Schneckenburger), nor to a traditionary embellishment of one and the same history (Strauss, de Wette). The two events are in reality different, though analogous. The former demoniac was dumb, while this one is both dumb and blind; which latter circumstance Luke, following a less accurate tradition, does not record." Meyer.

Ver. 22. **One possessed with a devil, blind and dumb.**—Not blind and dumb by nature, but by demoniac possession. To relieve one so fearfully under the power of the enemy, was the most difficult miracle, especially as the Pharisees watched Him with unbelief and in bitterness of heart.

Ver. 23. **Is this the Son of David?**—The people were here on the point of openly proclaiming Jesus as the Son of David, or the Messiah. But they were prevented by the hierarchical party, who now came forward with their blasphemous accusation.

Ver. 24. **This** (significantly put first)—should it be *this one?* *This one* does not cast out devils, etc.*

* [Meyer: "Μήτι οὗτος, etc. Question of surprise, where the emphasis lies on οὗτος: It can hardly be that *this* man, who otherwise has not the appearance of the Messiah, should be the Messiah."—P. S.]

—We have already shown that the term **Beelzebul** is equivalent to, **the prince of the devils**; hence the latter expression (ἄρχοντι, without an article) serves as explanation of a name invented by them, probably with reference to Beelzebub, the god of the Philistines.

Ver. 26. **If Satan casts out Satan.**—Meyer rightly argues against the rendering, If one Satan cast out another. "There are many demons, but Satan alone is the chief of them." Hence the charge implied, that Satan was represented both by the demon who possessed the individual, and by the demoniac exorcist; or, that in reality he cast himself out. In the same sense Christ employs also the simile of a city or a house divided against itself. Not that He denied that discord prevails in the kingdom of darkness; but this does not amount to an absolute breach, or to complete self-negation, which would necessarily lead to immediate annihilation. On the other hand, it is to be observed, that the kingdom of Satan had been of long standing, and hence must possess a certain measure of unity and consistency. The argumentation of Jesus was based on the distinction between this relative and an absolute division in the kingdom of Satan, and not, as de Wette supposes, on transferring the principles of the kingdom of light to that of darkness. Meyer is also right in suggesting, that the supposition of the Pharisees, that Satan might in this instance have damaged his own cause, is refuted by the constant antagonism waged between Christ and the kingdom of darkness. Besides, it deserves notice, that Christ here claimed to cast out, not merely individual demons, but Satan himself.*

* [We add the remarks of TRENCH (*Notes on the Miracles of our Lord*, 6th ed., p. 59): "There is at first sight a difficulty in the argument which our Saviour draws from the oneness of the kingdom of Satan—namely, that it seems the very idea of this kingdom, that it should be an anarchy, blind rage and hate not merely against God, but each part of it warring against every other part. And this is most deeply true, that hell is as much in arms against itself as against heaven; neither does our Lord deny that *in respect of itself* that kingdom is infinite contradiction and division: only he asserts that *in relation to the kingdom of heaven* it is one; there is one life in it and one soul in opposition to that. Just as a nation or kingdom may embrace within itself infinite parties, divisions, discords, jealousies, and heartburnings; yet if it is to subsist as a nation at all, it must not, *as regards other nations*, have lost its sense of unity; when

Ver. 27. **Your children**—*i. e.*, in a spiritual sense, your disciples, Jewish exorcists, Acts xix. 13. *Argumentum ex concessis.* On the exorcism of the Pharisees, *see* von Ammon, *Leben Jesu*, ii. p. 151. "In the schools of the Pharisees, a so-called higher magic was taught, by which demons were to be expelled and drawn out of the noses of persons possessed, by means of certain roots, by exorcism, and by magical formulas, supposed to have been derived from king Solomon." Comp. Joseph. *Ant.* viii. 2, 5; *De Bello Jud.* vii. 6, 2.—It were an entire misunderstanding, with Gerlach, to apply the expression, "*your children*," to the disciples of Jesus. Nor is there any ground for apprehending that the authority of the miracles of Jesus might be invalidated by an acknowledgment of Jewish exorcism. Compare the contrast between Moses and the magicians of Egypt.

Ver. 28. **The kingdom of God is come upon** [not: **unto**] **you.**—As in 1 Thess. iv. 15, so here, the term ἔφθασεν must be taken in its full meaning: *It has come upon you in a sudden manner, by surprise*, and finds you unprepared. The statement also implied that Jesus stood before them as the Messiah. Thus ver. 28 forms a transition from the defensive to the offensive; while the expression, ἐν πνεύματι Θεοῦ, which refers to the contrast with Beelzebul, serves as introduction to what is afterward said about the blasphemy of the Holy Spirit.

Ver. 29. **Or else, how can one.**—This is not merely "another argument," but at the same time also a more explicit statement of the idea, that, compared to Satan, Jesus was the stronger, or the Lord of the kingdom of heaven.—**The strong man** (τοῦ ἰσχυροῦ), with the article—with special reference to the τίς, who combats him; but also with a view to the fact, that the preceding explanation rendered the figure completely perspicuous. Comp. Isa. xlix. 24.—"**And take from him his instruments,**" σκεύη.—Referring to those who were possessed. [The author. version, "*spoil his goods*," gives a different sense.] The casting out of devils implied the binding of the strong man, *i. e.*, a spiritual victory over Satan. No doubt the Lord here alludes to the history of the temptation in Matt. iv. At a later period, Christ had, indeed, to enter on another physical, psychical, and spiritual conflict with Satan, when He was assailed by the enemy in connection with the sorrows and the misery of the world. But His former victory over the temptation from the *lust* of the world, laid the foundation and prepared the way for His later conquest.

Ver. 30. **He that is not with Me.**—The decisive moment of the breach with the opposition in Galilee was approaching. The idea is further carried out in ch. xxi. 43, 44. On this occasion, however, it was still couched in hypothetical and general language. Still, the alternative here presented evidently applied to the Pharisees and scribes; and any other interpretation overlooks the importance of that decisive moment. (Bengel, Schleiermacher, and Neander apply it to Jewish exorcists; Chrysostom, to Satan, etc.) This is further shown by what follows: **wherefore I say unto you;** viz., with reference to your blasphemy of My Person, by which your enmity appears. Know then what this enmity implies. In significant contrast the Saviour says in reference to the disciples, Mark ix. 40 and Luke ix. 50, "He that is not *against* us is *for* us." [Alford: "I believe Stier is right in regarding it as a saying setting forth to us generally the entire and complete disjunction of the two kingdoms, of Satan and God. There is and can be in the world *no middle party;* they who are not with Christ are against Him and His work, and as far as in them lies are undoing it."—P. S.]

Ver. 31. **All manner of sin and blasphemy.**—*i. e.*, Every sin shall be forgiven to men, even to blasphemy in the general sense, provided they do not progress to blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, but turn from it. Hence, on the supposition of repentance. And thus shall it be in every case—they shall either return, or progress to blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. The blasphemy which is still capable of being forgiven, is both a species and an aggravation of general sin. De Wette: "βλασφημία, not merely blasphemy against God; but, on the other hand, not simply evil-speaking generally, but defaming of what is holy, as, for example, of Christ, the Sent of God." In general, the idea of a malicious attack upon a person, whose fame is calumniously injured (βλάπτειν τὴν φήμην), attaches to the term, blasphemy. Hence, defamation of what is good, noble, and holy, on its appearance in the world, with malicious (lying and murderous) intent. Up to this point blasphemy forms the climax of sin, but of sin which may still be forgiven; because, in his fanatical enthusiasm for what he deems noble, good, and holy, a man may overlook and misunderstand even a higher manifestation of it. But blasphemy against the Holy Spirit cannot be forgiven. It is open and full opposition to conversion, and hence to forgiveness. The Holy Spirit, who is here spoken of in distinct terms, is the last and highest manifestation of the Spirit of God, who completes and perfects the revelation of God, and in that capacity manifests Himself in the human consciousness. Blasphemously to rebel, in opposition to one's better knowledge and conscience, against this manifestation and influence of the Holy Spirit, is to commit moral suicide, and to destroy one's religious and moral susceptibility. In fact, this can never be fully accomplished, on account of the infinite contrast between blasphemy and the Holy Spirit. But the approximation thereto implies impending judgment, which extends far beyond the present world into endless existence. Although blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, in its full idea, is infinite, yet blasphemy against the Son of Man, or against Christ in the form of a servant, constitutes an approximation to it. Hence the Lord adds, ver. 22, by way of explanation, as approximating to this sin: Whosoever speaketh *a word* (in passing) against the Son of Man. The person whom, from prejudice or ignorance, a word of blasphemy may escape against Christ—whom in His form as a servant he may possibly mistake—shall be forgiven; but whosoever speaketh (without the addition, *a word*)—whosoever speaketh decidedly against the Holy Spirit, etc. In this case, to speak and to blaspheme is identical.—Meyer and other critics maintain that the accusation of the Pharisees, in ver. 24, was an instance of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. But theirs was, in the first place, only a blasphemy against the Son of Man, and against the power in which He wrought. In committing this sin, they necessarily approximated blasphemy against the Holy Spirit; but how

it does so, of necessity it falls to pieces and perishes. To the Pharisees He says: 'This kingdom of evil subsists; by your own confession it does so; it cannot therefore have denied the one condition of its existence, which is, that it should not lend its powers to the overthrowing of itself, that it should not side with its own foes; My words and works declare that I am its foe, it cannot therefore be siding with Me.'"—P. S.]

closely (*see* John vii. 39), our Lord does not express, as appears even from the peculiar warning given them of their danger. In these circumstances, criticism cannot help us in defining the matter more clearly. In the Gospel of Mark, the first statement (about blasphemy) alone is mentioned; in that of Luke, the second (about speaking a word).

Ver. 32. **Neither in this world**; or, rather, in this Æon.—Ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος, עוֹלָם הַזֶּה; ὁ αἰὼν μέλλων, עוֹלָם הַבָּא. *See* Lightfoot, Wetstein, and others. In the first place, the period before and after Christ's "appearing"; then, secondarily, the contrast between the one and the other order of things, as based on the old and the new era. It should not be overlooked that His historical advent laid the foundation for His future παρουσία, and consequently that the new æon, like the kingdom of heaven, is already at hand, and unfolding itself in the old, breaking through it and gradually abolishing it. Hence the Jewish theology was not wrong in dating the new æon from the advent of the Messiah; only they were wrong in not making a proper distinction between the suffering and the glorified Messiah.

Ver. 33. **Either exhibit, present** (in the authorized version, *make*).—The term ποιεῖν cannot refer to "planting," as we have here an allusion not only to the tree but also to its fruit. It must refer to a mental act, or to a representation, and alludes here to the ποιεῖν of the poets.* Those who blaspheme are bad and self-contradictory poets. In the strangest manner, they conceive and represent as a poisonous tree (Christ as inspired by Satan) that which only yielded good fruit (casting out of devils). Hence, not in the sense of a declarative judgment—*make* (Theophylact, Erasmus, Meyer, etc.); least of all with exclusive reference to the Pharisees (Münster, Castellio, de Wette); nor yet as equivalent to *put*, or plant, regarding and treating these blasphemies as fruits (Ewald); but in the sense of, *to suppose, to represent* (Grotius, Fritzsche, etc.). The first tree is manifestly intended as an emblem of Christ; the second, of the Pharisees, who manifested their inward state by their outward fruit, or their blasphemy. **For the tree is known by its fruit**; comp. ch. vii. 20.

Ver. 34. **O brood of vipers.**—The terms in which the Baptist had from the outset addressed the Pharisees (ch. iii. 7), are now taken up even by the merciful and compassionate Saviour. The expression γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν is closely allied with the δένδρον σαπρόν. Poisonous plants, and a generation of vipers, were the noxious remnants of pre-Adamic times, and hence served as allegorical figures of satanic evil (which are not to be confounded with the thorns and thistles consequent upon the curse). Hence the first symbol of coming salvation was, that the seed of the woman should bruise the head of the *serpent*.—**How can ye?** etc.—The *physical* impossibility that a generation of vipers could give forth what was salutary, served as an emblem of the moral impossibility of this moral generation of vipers speaking good things.

For out of the abundance, the overflowing.—But this abundance is not passive; it is organic, and reproducing itself. With this it may be well to connect the biblical idea of περισσεύειν, *to develop organically*.

Ver. 35. **Out of the good treasure.**—Another figure in which the heart is represented as a spiritual treasury. Each one can only give forth what he finds in his treasury. The expression, *heart*, implies the sum-total of all the thoughts, words, and works of a man; in short, his entire spiritual possessions.

Vers. 36, 37. **Every idle word.**—The term ῥῆμα, in its connection with ἀργόν, meaning *morally useless*, and at the same time hurtful,—πονηρόν, as some minuscule MSS. read. This judgment according to their words, would not exclude that according to their deeds. From Matt. xxv. 31, we gather that the actions of the righteous and of the wicked are sealed by their words. A man's speech, as elucidating, and elucidated by, his life, will serve as a sufficient index of his character in the day of judgment —as Heubner explains it, partly from its wickedness, and partly from its pharisaical severity, which recoils on him who is guilty of it.

Ver. 38. **Then certain of the scribes and of the Pharisees answered.**—His opponents felt that, in these statements, Jesus had confronted them in His character as the Messiah, invested with royal and judicial authority. Accordingly, they were constrained either to acknowledge or to reject His claims. In this difficulty, some of them tried to tempt Him; *i. e.*, partly in derision, and partly with a lingering desire after the manifestation of a worldly Messiah, they asked for a *sign*, by way of accrediting His claims. No doubt they referred to the chiliastic sign from heaven. Thus we notice here the appearance of a new hostile device, which appears in its full proportions in ch. xvi. 1, just as that which had first appeared in ch. ix. 34 had now been fully brought out. Gerlach and Lisco suggest that these Pharisees were better inclined, and less opposed to Jesus, than the others. But in our opinion, they were rather the worst among the bad.

Ver. 39. **An adulterous generation.**—Μοιχαλίς. Theophylact: ὡς ἀφιστάμενοι ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ. Adultery, taken in a spiritual sense, according to the Old Testament idea, equivalent to apostasy or idolatry; Isa. xviii. 17. Jesus foreknew that the apostasy of the Pharisees would lead them even to an outward alliance with the heathen in the act of His crucifixion.

There shall no sign be given to it.—Christ considered His miracles as signs, John xi. 41. The perfect sign of His Messiahship, however, was His death on the cross, and His resurrection. And as the true Messiah was exactly the opposite of the carnal counterfeit which the Pharisees had drawn for themselves, so was the true and great sign of the Messiah the direct contrary to their carnal and unwarranted clamor for a sign from heaven. This applies especially to the solemn call to repentance which His answer contained. The Pharisees sought a sign from heaven, to confirm and to crown with success their own corrupt views and state: the Lord offered them a sign from the deep of the realm of death, to condemn their hypocritical worldliness. Hence the *sign of Jonah; i. e.*, the sign which had typically appeared in the history of Jonah, ii. 1.

Ver. 40. **The belly of the great fish:** τοῦ κήτους, דָּג גָּדוֹל.—The expression does not necessarily mean a *whale* [as the E. V. translates], but any sea-monster. We suppose it was a shark [the white shark, *squalus carcharias*, also called *lamia*, which is found to this day in the Mediterranean, sometimes as long as sixty feet.—P. S.] rather than

* *See* the well-known beginning of Horace's *Ars poetica*.

a whale. Heubner relates an instance of a sailor who was swallowed by a shark, and yet preserved.

So shall the Son of man be three days and three nights.—A round number according to the popular mode of Hebrew reckoning, 1 Sam. xxx. 12; although Christ lay only one day and two nights in the grave.*—**In the heart of the earth.**—1. In the grave. So most interpreters. 2. In hades (Tertullian, Irenæus, etc.).† Meyer pronounces in favor of the interpretation hades, on the supposition that it is analogous to καρδία τῆς θαλάσσης in Jonah ii., which referred to the depths of the sea. Besides, in Luke xxiii. 43, Christ Himself had designated His death as a descent into hades [or rather an entrance into paradise as a part of hades].—But we remark, first, that these two things, the grave and the realm of the dead, cannot be disjoined. Secondly, that the Lord frequently uses the term, "earth," in reference to the ancient hierarchical and political constitution of the world. Jonah was only buried in the depths of the sea; Christ in that of the ancient earth (the grave and hades), and of the ancient world (its condemnation and contumely). Paulus, Schleiermacher, Neander, and others, apply the expression, "*sign of Jonah the prophet*," to the *preaching* and *appearance* of the Lord. But this view requires no formal refutation. Such could scarcely have been designated as in any specific sense a sign of the prophet Jonah; not to speak of the fact that it ignores the explanation furnished in the Gospel of Matthew itself. We do not deny, however, that the expression may contain some reference to the universal mission of Jonah, which constituted him a type of Christ. Jonah was unwilling to preach to the heathen Ninevites, and was buried in the depths of the sea, which is an emblem of the sea of nations. Jesus designed His gospel for all nations, and was hurled by the Jewish hierarchy into the depth of the earth, and into that of their theocratic and hierarchical condemnation. But Jonah emerged once more to preach repentance to the Gentiles; so Christ also rose to preach the gospel to the nations.—The circumstance, that our Lord repeats this simile in Matt. xvi. 4, shows that He attached considerable importance to it.

Ver. 41. **Shall rise**—*i. e.*, as witnesses in the judgment. "So קוּם in Job xvi. 8."—Ὅτι, *for;* not, *because* [as in the author. version].—This judgment is that of the Lord.

Ver. 42. **The queen of the south.**—*See* 1 Kings x., and the article *Sheba* in Winer's *Real-Wörterb.* [and in Calmet's *Diction. of the H. Bible*, Taylor's edit., Lond., p. 815 sqq.]. Sabæa, a district in Arabia Felix. Josephus erroneously represents her as a queen of Ethiopia (*Ant.* viii. 5, 5). Similarly, modern Abyssinian tradition assigns to her the name of Maqueda, and represents her as a convert to Judaism, and as having had a son by Solomon, whose name was Menilek. The Arabs mention her, under the name of *Balkis*, among the rulers of Yemen.

Ver. 43. **When the unclean spirit is gone out of a man.**—A simile referring to the state of the Jewish nation, with special reference to the casting out of devils, and to the blasphemy of the Pharisees and scribes, which had just taken place. The man set free from the unclean spirit is an emblem of the Jewish nation as under the sway of Pharisaism. Hence the healing represents the blessed and gracious activity of Jesus in Israel.—The unclean spirit who is cast out walketh through dry desert places—deserts being represented as the habitation of devils, Job viii. 3; Bar. iv. 35; Rev. xviii. 2; Lev. xvi. 21. The wilderness, an emblem of their dwelling-place in another world, of their activity, of their desolation and their banishment into desolation.

Ver. 44. **He findeth the house empty, swept, and garnished.**—Not, as de Wette has it, the soul restored, but inviting to the unclean spirit,—not being inhabited by a good spirit.

Ver. 45. **Seven other spirits more wicked than himself.**—This evidently refers to a more full possession by devils,—*i. e.*, to a voluntary and damnable self-surrender to Satan by a wicked life, or to such hardening of unbelief as that of which the Jewish hierarchy and nation were guilty.—**And the last state is worse than the first.**—Their former low and miserable estate is followed by moral guilt, and a voluntary surrender to the power of evil,—such, alas! as has been manifested in the history of Israel.

From the details of Christ's dealing with the Pharisees, as recorded by Luke, we derive a clear view of His increasing earnestness and directness in reproving them. What in the beginning He had only said to the disciples in the first Sermon on the Mount, and in His instruction to the Apostles, He now publicly repeated,—partly in the hearing of the Pharisees themselves, and partly in presence of all His professing disciples.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. "From this and other passages of Scripture (vers. 26–30), we learn that the kingdom of darkness has also its head, who serves as a centre of connection, combining all the isolated forces into common resistance to Christ and His kingdom."—Lisco. *See* ch. xiii.

2. The position of the Lord with reference to the pharisaical party had now reached that stage of decision when each one must choose a distinct part

* [St. Jerome: "This is to be explained by a figure of speech called *synecdoche*, by which a part is put for the whole; not that our Lord was three whole days and three nights in the grave, but part of Friday, part of Sunday, and the whole of Saturday were reckoned as three days." Meyer: "*Jesus war nur einen Tag und zwei Nächte todt. Allein nach populärer Weise* (*vergl.* 1 *Sam. xxx.* 12 *sq.*) *sind die Theile des ersten und dritten Tages als ganze Tage gezählt, wozu die darzustellende gegenbildliche Aehnlichkeit mit dem Schicksal des Jonas veranlasste.*" Alford: "If it be necessary to make good the three days and nights, it must be done by having recourse to the Jewish method of computing time. In the Jerusalem Talmud (cited by Lightfoot) it is said 'that a day and night together make up a עוֹנָה (a νυχθήμερον), and that any part of such a period is counted as the whole.' *See* Gen. xl. 13, 20; 1 Sam. xxx. 12, 13; 2 Chron. x. 5, 12; Hos. vi. 2." Wordsworth: "The days of Christ's absence from His disciples were shortened in mercy to them as far as was consistent with the fulfilment of the prophecy (?).—P. S.]

† [So also Theophylact, Bellarmin, Maldonatus, Olshausen, König (*Lehre von der Höllenfahrt Christi*, 1842, p. 54), Alford, Wordsworth, while D. Brown and all the American commentators of Matthew, A. Barnes, J. A. Alexander, Owen, Whedon (Jacobus' Notes I have not at hand), understand the *heart of the earth* to mean simply the *grave*. But hades agrees better with the parallel of the belly of the sea-monster, than the tomb of Joseph of Arimathea, which was on the *surface* of the earth rather than in the *heart* thereof; secondly, Jonah himself calls the belly of the sea-monster בֶּטֶן שְׁאוֹל, LXX: ἐκ κοιλίας ᾅδου, "out of the belly of hades" (not *hell* as in the E. V.), Jon. ii. 3 (2); and finally, there should be no more dispute now as to Christ's actual descent into hades, *see* Luke xxiii. 43; Acts ii. 27, 31 (Greek text); Eph. iv. 9; 1 Pet. iii. 19. But no doctrinal statements concerning the *locality* of hades can be justly derived from such popular expressions, which must necessarily adapt themselves to our imperfect finite conceptions.—P. S.]

This was clearly indicated in the solemn statement,—*He that is not with Me* (in this conflict) *is against Me* (and hence on the side of Satan, against whom the conflict is waged); *and he that gathereth not with Me* (in the harvest) *scattereth abroad* (is a destroyer of God's harvest).

3. *Blasphemy against the Holy Spirit*, vers. 31, 32.—For a full discussion of this subject, we must refer to other works, especially my *Leben Jesu*, ii. 2, p. 825; my *Posit. Dogmatik*, p. 453, and the exegetical, dogmatical, and ethical treatise of PHIL. SCHAFF: *Die Sünde wider den Heil. Geist*, Halle, 1841 (written with reference to the dissertations on the same subject by Grashof, and Gurlitt in the *Studien und Kritiken* for 1833 and 1834; Tholuck in his *Miscellanies*, 1839; Nitzsch, *System der christlichen Lehre*, etc., and with a historical appendix on the terrible end of Francesco Spiera).* "In all the legislations of antiquity, a distinction was made between inexpiable and expiable transgressions. Blasphemy of the Divine name belonged to the former class. If, therefore, there was anything inexpiable and unpardonable under the New Testament dispensation, blasphemy would naturally be the Old Testament symbol of it. Nor can there be any doubt that the Lord had, in *this* respect, warned His hearers against the sin of blasphemy; at the same time distinguishing various degrees of it (Matt. xii. 31; Mark iii. 28; Luke xii. 10). More especially do we gather from the Gospel of Mark, that Jesus here intended to define more accurately, or to give a more correct explanation of, the law of Moses, in Lev. xxiv. In that passage, a punishment was denounced (וְנָשָׂא חֶטְאוֹ) against any blasphemy of the Deity (קִלֵּל אֱלֹהִים), while the punishment of death was awarded to express blasphemy of שֵׁם־י׳. This distinction between simply punishable and absolutely unpardonable blasphemy (*κακολογία*, 1 Sam. iii. 13, Sept.), was explained by the Saviour, in the Gospel of Mark, in the sense that the *pardonable* sin consisted in blasphemy against Elohim, while in the Gospel of Matthew, He applied it to blasphemy against the Divine Messenger, or the Son of Man. In both Gospels, however, the unpardonable blasphemy against the *name* of Jehovah, is further explained as being the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. We cannot, therefore, see sufficient ground for the view advocated by Olshausen in his Commentary, that there were three degrees in the sin of blasphemy—that against the Father, that against the Son, and, finally, that against the Holy Spirit." (Nitzsch, *System*, etc., p. 200.) The following dogmatical points seem to us of special importance: (1) From its very nature, every sin tends toward blasphemy, and every blasphemy toward blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. (2) It is unscriptural to identify blasphemy against the Holy Spirit with sin against the Holy Spirit.† This mistake has given rise to much distress of mind, and should be carefully avoided.* (3) Accordingly, we must reject as unsatisfactory and dangerous the patristic and other specifications of this sin as if it referred to rejection of the gospel (Gnosticism, according to Irenæus), or to denial of the divinity of Christ (Athanasius and Hilarius), or to every mortal sin committed after baptism (Origen), or "*duritia cordis usque ad finem hujus vitæ*,"—meaning thereby every impenitent death in the judgment of the Church (Augustine), or to the sin of the Pharisees, as recorded in the text (as some modern interpreters have it). (4) A complete commission of this sin can scarcely be conceived, since the Holy Spirit would withdraw His manifestations from the blasphemer; and the latter would be staggered, being unable always to perceive the presence of the Spirit of God. (Hence the view of H. L. Nitzsch the elder is not without a measure of truth: *de peccato homini cavendo, quamquam in hominem non cadente*. Viteb. 1802.) (5) Still, according to the statement of the Lord, and from the very nature of the thing, a man may approach most closely to this sin, even to the insuring of his own certain condemnation. (6) Consequently, this state must be regarded as a hardening of the mind, which leads to, and manifests itself in, blasphemies. But we cannot agree with Grashof and Tholuck, in regarding this state as pure hatred against what is holy; nor yet with Nitzsch, as decided deadness and complete indifference. We conceive, with Schaff, that these two elements are here combined, since it is impossible to hate the *true life* without complete deadness, or, on the other hand, to be completely dead *to the true life* without hating it. (7) It is necessary to bear in mind that, following the example of the Lord, this warning must be cautiously handled. He only employed it at a season of extreme peril, and in the prospect of that sin. Heubner: "The Holy Spirit is referred to in the text more *operative* than *personaliter*, as a Divine principle, working on the heart of man in the way of awakening, rousing, and urging them, of all which man is conscious." Still the complete revelation of the Holy Spirit includes also that of His personal glory; and blasphemy against what is *holy* is closely allied to blasphemy against the *Person* of the Spirit. Compare, however, the instructive communications of Heubner, p. 170 sqq., on this question.

4. *Neither in this world, nor in the world to come*, ver. 32.—De Wette: "The expression is evidently equivalent to *never*, in the absolute sense, no matter whether we understand the terms ὁ αἰὼν ὁ μέλλων of the kingdom of Messiah and of eternity, or only of the latter. But, in order to deduce from it the eternity of future punishments (Olshausen), we would require to take the words of Jesus in their strict literality, while they are evidently a proverbial expression (*see* Wetstein). The mild Chrysostom saw nothing in them beyond the idea of highest guilt,—or, perhaps, more correctly, difficulty of amendment." †—But what

* [Comp. also JULIUS MÜLLER: "*Die christliche Lehre von der Sünde*, 3d ed., in the latter part of the second volume. An English translation of this profound and important work by WM. PULSFORD (*The Christian Doctrine of Sin exhibited*) appeared at Edinburgh, 1852, as a part of Clark's *Foreign Library*.—P. S.]

† [In the wider sense every sin of the believer who has experienced the power and influence of the Holy Spirit, may be called a sin against the Holy Spirit, although far from approaching the nature and guilt of blasphemy. The Scripture speaks of quenching the Spirit, 1 Thess. v. 19, grieving the Holy Spirit of God, Eph. iv 30, resisting the same, Acts vii. 51, and vexing him, Isa. lxiii. 10; but all these sins are still within the reach of pardon. M. HENRY: "It is not all speaking against the person or essence of the Holy Spirit, or some of His more private operations, or merely the resisting of His internal working in the sinner himself, that is here meant; for *who then should be saved?*"—P. S.]

* The common reply to such doubts is well known. It is to the effect, that he who is guilty of the sin against the Holy Spirit would not feel sorrow for it; and that the fact of such sorrow is itself an evidence that this sin has not been committed. [So also M. Henry *in loc.*: "We have reason to think, that none are guilty of this sin, who believe that Christ is the *Son of God*, and sincerely desire to have part in His merit and mercy: and those who fear they have committed this sin, give a good sign that they have not."—P. S.]

† [In the same way even WORDSWORTH weakens the force of οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται: "is very *unlikely* to obtain forgiveness." He quotes from Augustine, *Retract.* I.

if this difficulty were here declared absolute, or amounting to an impossibility? Nor must we lose sight of the fact, that there can be nothing general or unmeaning in a declaration which contains some most important dogmatic distinctions. The following ideas are evidently laid down in it: (1) In every sin there is hope of pardon, except in this,—the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. (2) Pardon may be accorded in the world to come, as well as in this world. Comp. 1 Pet. iii. 19; iv. 6. (3) There is no pardon either in this world, or in the world to come, for blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. (4) To blaspheme against the Son of Man, is to approximate to this sin; but in how far and how closely, the Lord does not warrant us to say. (5) The decision as to the amount of difference between the damnable approximation to the sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, and that sin itself, belongs to God alone, who rules both in this world and in that which is to come. (6) Even an approximation to this sin leads to corresponding punishment in this world. (7) It is of the utmost importance that this sin should be described as one manifesting itself in a completely hardened state of mind, and in analogous outward expressions. This may be popularly explained as follows: God *cannot* forgive this sin, because it consists in perfect hardening and impenitence; and therefore *will* He *not* forgive it. True, such hardening is itself a judgment of God; yet in the sense that its guilt arises from, and depends upon, the moral state of man, and not on any fate or decree connected with time, place, or anything that is external.

[The importance of the subject justifies and demands some remarks, explanatory and cautionary, on the second inference of Dr. Lange from ver. 32, concerning the *remission of sins in the future world*, since it runs contrary to the old Protestant doctrine, and the prevailing views of the Anglo-American churches.

St. Augustine was the first, I believe, who clearly and decidedly drew this inference from the passage, *De Civit. Dei*, xxi. 24 (Opera ed. Bened. vol. vii. p. 642 sq.): "*Sicut etiam facta resurrectione mortuorum non deerunt quibus post pœnas, quas patiuntur spiritus mortuorum, impertiatur misericordia, ut in ignem non mittantur æternum. Neque enim de quibusdam veraciter diceretur, quod non eis remittatur neque in hoc sæculo, neque in futuro* (Matt. xii. 32), *nisi essent quibus, etsi non in isto, tamen remittetur in futuro.*" Since that time, this passage, together with 1 Cor. iii. 15 (αὐτὸς δὲ σωθήσεται, οὕτως δὲ ὡς διὰ πυρός), has been often quoted by fathers, schoolmen, and modern Roman divines, in favor of the doctrine of purgatory, and a probationary state after death. Compare Maldonatus *ad loc.*: "*Cæterum recte Augustinus et Gregorius, Beda, Bernardus, ex hoc loco purgatorium probaverunt, ... colligentes aliqua in futuro sæculo peccata remitti.*" Several modern Protestant commentators of Germany, including Olshausen (vol. i. 460, in Kendrick's edition, who lets it pass without protest), find a similar idea implied in this declaration of our Lord, but they divest it, of course, of the Romish figment of purgatory.

The Roman system, according to the principle: *extra ecclesiam* (*Romanam*) *nulla salus*, hopelessly condemns to hell all unbaptized persons, including children, though, of course, with different degrees of punishment, according to the measure of guilt (*see* Dante's *Inferno*), and confines the second probation of purgatory exclusively to imperfect *Christians*, who are too good for hell and too bad for heaven, and consequently must pass after death through a tedious and painful process of penances and self-purifications before their final entrance into heaven. The modern German Protestant opinion in its evangelical form, starting from the idea of the absolute justice and universal love of God, maintains that Christ will ultimately be revealed to all human beings, and prove to them, according to their faith or unbelief, either a savor of life unto life, or of death unto death; that there is therefore a possibility of pardon and salvation in the state between death and the resurrection for unbaptized children, heathen, and all others who die innocently ignorant of Christ; and that pardon can be obtained there on the same condition as here, viz., repentance and faith in Christ whenever He is presented to them. Some lay the stress on the declaration that *all* sins are *pardonable* save one, and conclude, that *final* condemnation will not take place till after the blasphemy of the Holy Spirit, which implies a previous *knowledge of Christianity*. Several Greek fathers, and Luther and Zwingli, likewise, entertained hopeful views concerning the final fate of virtuous heathen.

But the orthodox Protestant divines of England, Scotland, and America almost unanimously reject the whole idea of a probationary state and the possibility of forgiveness after death, and deny that this passage justifies any inference favorable to it. We quote some of the latest commentators on Matthew. Alford: "No sure inference can be drawn from the words οὔτε ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι with regard to forgiveness of sins in a future state. . . . In the most entire silence of Scripture on any such doctrine, every principle of sound interpretation requires that we should hesitate to support it by two difficult passages [he refers to 1 Pet. iii. 19], in neither of which does the plain construction of the words absolutely require it." Wordsworth (who in this case omits to quote from his favorite fathers): "Some have hence inferred that sins not forgiven in this world may be forgiven in another. But this inference contradicts the general teaching of Scripture (Luke xvi. 26; John ix. 4; Heb. iii. 13; ix. 27). . . . The phrase taken together signifies *nunquam*, and is a Hebraism found in the Talmud." Owen: "The whole expression, '*neither in this world, neither* [*nor*] *in the world to come*,' is beyond all question an emphatic *never*." Then he contradicts Olshausen, and adds that the idea of the remission of sins in the other world "is neither taught here, nor in 1 Pet. iii. 18 [19], and is directly at war with many other passages, expressly declaring the immutability of the soul's condition beyond the grave." Nast: "*Neither in this world nor the world to come.* The Greek word for *world* is αἰών, *age;* it was a proverbial expression among the Jews, meaning neither at present nor in future, that is: *never*, as Mark also expresses it in the parallel passage: 'He has never forgiveness.' Most of the modern theologians of Germany infer from this passage that since it is said that the sin or blasphemy

19: "*De nullo quamvis pessimo in hac vita desperandum est.*" This is true enough, because we never know whether a man has committed the unpardonable sin, and we must go on the assumption that he has not. The only hopeless case was that of Judas after Christ Himself with His infallible knowledge had called him the *son of perdition*, for whom it were better never to have been born. Meyer (p. 268, note) correctly observes: "The *eternity* of punishment here taught is not to be explained away and changed into 'difficulty of amendment' (de Wette), or reduced to the milder conception of the highest degree of guilt (Chrysostom), or greatest difficulty of forgiveness (Socinians), and such like." Whedon: "It is difficult to say in what words the eternity of retribution could be more unequivocally expressed."—P. S.]

against the Holy Ghost alone shall not be forgiven neither in this world nor in the world to come, there is a possibility of pardon for all other sins even in the world to come; that is, that those who die in a state of impenitence, not involving the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, will either proceed in the spirit-world in their downward course, till their sin is the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, or that, if they should repent, they may find pardon." Then, after quoting Alford against this opinion, Dr. Nast adds: "So much is certain, that it would be reckless folly to put off the one thing needful to an uncertain futurity or the state after death, of which the Bible says so little, where the means of grace are, even if not entirely cut off, not as powerful as here; add to this, that the longer conversion is put off the more difficult it becomes."

At the same time, however, American Protestant divines generally incline to the belief that all *infants* who die in infancy, whether baptized or not, will be saved by the atonement of Christ. This would involve the salvation of the greater part of the human family, since one half of them are supposed to die in infancy; while the Roman Catholic orthodoxy, by asserting the necessity of baptism for salvation, excludes all the unbaptized from the kingdom of heaven.

A full discussion of the final fate of the countless millions of human beings who live and die without any knowledge of Christ, would require us to take into consideration the various passages which relate to the heathen, Matt. xi. 21-24; xii. 41, 42; xv. 28; Acts x. 35; xiv. 16, 17; Rom. i. 19-21; ii. 11-15, 26-29, and to the manifestation of the Logos before His incarnation, John i. 5, 9, 10, together with the Old Testament examples of the working of divine grace outside of the covenant of circumcision among such persons as Melchisedek (the priest-king and type of Christ), Jethro, Rahab, Ruth (who are in the genealogy of Christ), Hiram, the Queen of Sheba, Naeman, Job, and the wise men from the East, who, following the star of promise and hope, came to worship the new born king of the Jews; also the passages on Christ's descent into hades, and preaching to the spirits in prison, Acts ii. 27, 31; 1 Pet. iii. 19; iv. 6, about which, however, there is a wide difference of interpretation.

In these passages carefully compared, as well as in the general Scripture doctrine of the absolute justice and goodness of God, I see much to encourage the charitable hope that God in His infinite mercy will ultimately save, in some way, all infants who die before having committed actual transgression, and such adult heathen as live and die in a frame of mind predisposed to receive the gospel or in an humble and earnest desire after salvation (such as we find, for instance, in Cornelius before the arrival of Peter). But even this is not to be taught as an article of faith, since the Bible, wise in its silence as in its teaching, gives us no explicit revelation on the subject.

The following general propositions on this whole question will probably be approved as sound and scriptural by the majority of evangelical divines, at least in America:

(1) There can be no salvation out of Christ.

(2) There is no second probation after death, but the present life determines the final fate of every man. "In the place where the tree falleth, there it shall be" (Eccles. xi. 3). "Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap" (Gal. vi. 7).

(3) *We* are bound to the ordinary means of grace, but God is free, and "will have mercy upon whom he will have mercy" (Rom. ix. 15).

(4) God will judge every man according to his measure of light and opportunity, and it will be "more tolerable" for the heathen at the judgment day than for such as sinned against a positive revelation (comp. Matt. xi. 22-26).

(5) God "who is no respecter of persons" (comp. Acts x. 35), and is infinitely more just and merciful than we can conceive of, will clear up, in the future world, all the mysteries of Providence in a manner that will call forth the everlasting praise and adoration of His people.—P. S.] *

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Opposite effects produced by the glorious manifestations of the Lord, in those who are susceptible, and in those who are opposed to Him: 1. Admiration, indignation; 2. confession, praise — rejection and blasphemy; or, recognition of the power and majesty of God, and reviling of the Divine revelation as the power of Satan.—The healing of one most fully possessed by an unclean spirit, more easy than the recovery of a hypocrite.—It argues a devilish mind to represent as satanic what is Divine.—Marks of the devilish cunning of the wicked: 1. They impute this cunning to the Holy One; 2. they surrender themselves to this cunning; 3. they are ensnared by the cunning of the Evil One without being aware of it.—The wicked artifice which attempts to represent that which is holy as an artifice, is itself the prey of the worst artifice.—Christ victorious over the calumny of His opponents: 1. In His defence; 2. in His justification and manifestation of Himself; 3. in His accusation of the Pharisees; 4. in His warning.—The consequences of sin.—In what sense can Satan be said to have a kingdom?—Christ the Almighty One, who has bound the strong man.—Any power which the Evil One wields here, belongs not to him of right, but is usurped and arrogated.—Unclean spirits envying and grieving at the happiness of man.—Solemn effect on His people in the world, to the last day, of the indignation of Christ, occasioned by the charge, that He carried on His work in conjunction with Satan.—The great hour of decision between Christ and Israel: 1. How awful; 2. how solemn; 3. how glorious.—The watchword of the Lord: For Me, or against Me.—Agreement between these two watchwords: he that is not with Me, etc., and he that is not against us, etc.—It may have been possible not to recognize the Son of Man in the form of a servant, but it is not possible wholly to ignore in our consciousness the Holy Spirit in His glory.—The Holy Spirit glorifies the Son of Man, and makes the cause of Christ His cause.—The sin of prejudice akin to, yet different from, the sin of conscious rejection of what is holy: 1. In its motive; 2. in its consciousness; 3. in its object; 4. in its effects.

Blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. 1. In its source: (*a*) sin in general; (*b*) blasphemy in general. 2. In its gradual manifestation: blasphemy of what is divine, of the Son of Man in the form of a servant. 3. In its completion: blasphemy against the highest revelation of God in our consciousness, or against the Spirit of the gospel which had roused the conscience.—A warning figure of that sin in all its fulness, and of complete condemnation.—The sin of the satanic consequence of pride, when man hardens his mind

* [This annotation of the Am. editor was partly rewritten (Febr. 1865) for the third edition, with a view to make it more clear and explicit.—P. S.]

against the Sun of highest revelation, whose rays penetrate into it.—Spiritual suicide, or the sin unto death (1 John v.), the end of one of two ways: 1. Of hardening; 2. of apostasy.—How the warning against blasphemy is to be applied by the children of God: 1. Each one is to beware of it; 2. it is not to be imputed to any one; 3. the tendency to judge others would lead to an opposite course of conduct. (For example, the Pharisees have committed it, but we cannot commit it; heretics, etc., but we the orthodox, etc.; those beyond the pale, etc., but we the priests, etc.; our opponents, etc., but we who are in the right, etc.)—Christ is always the same; and the glorious characteristics of the gospel appear even when He speaks of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit.—All manner of sin shall be forgiven unto men.

The tree is known by his fruit.—If we cannot condemn the fruit, we should not condemn the tree.—If we cannot praise the fruit, we should not commend the tree.—How men may become a generation of vipers in their relationship toward the kingdom of God.—Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh.—A man's words as indicating his inward state: 1. As being its fruit; 2. as being its spiritual coinage; 3. as being a decisive deed.—The account demanded of every idle word.—How our justification or condemnation may depend on the fugitive texture of our words.—Hypocrisy ever betraying itself by the base coin of its words.—Spiritual forgery the worst, and therefore the most unpardonable, fraud upon the kingdom of Christ.

The demand of a sign from heaven, made on the Lord of heaven, a sign of unbelief and hardening.—The sign of the Messiah from the deep, the highest sign from heaven.—Jonas a type of Christ.—Devout heathens the strongest witnesses against hypocritical Christians.—The queen of the south; or, holy longing in those who inhabit the dark places of the earth.—A greater than Jonah is here, and a greater than Solomon; or, Christ, the man of sorrows and the Lord of glory, in both respects surpassing all others: or, the glory of the New Testament; or, the combined glory of the preaching of repentance and of the doctrine of life, of deed and of word; or, the Lord going to those who are distant, and those who are distant coming to Him.—Hardening, a sevenfold possession.—The hardening of Israel.—Those who are possessed against their will, in a much better condition than those who voluntarily surrender themselves to be the instruments of unclean spirits.—The worst devils are those who pretend to be the most spiritual.—Lamentable condition of an individual, but especially of a nation, which renounces and contravenes its spiritual experiences.—The signs of an evil generation.

Starke:—The tyranny of Satan is great; for he deprives man both of the natural and spiritual gifts bestowed upon him.—*Hedinger*: Christ came into the world that He might destroy the works of the devil, 1 John iii. 8.—Is Satan a king who has a mighty kingdom; then who would not beware of him?—Christ alone is able to destroy the kingdom of Satan, Acts x. 38.—Where the Spirit of God is, there also is the kingdom of God, Rom. xiv. 17.—What concord hath Christ with Belial? 2 Cor. vi. 15.—*Majus*: The divinity of the Holy Spirit appears also from this, that the sin against Him is unpardonable, Heb. iii. 10, 11.—*Osiander*: Ministers should speak with caution of the sin against the Son of Man, and of that against the Holy Spirit, lest tender consciences be frightened and cast down.—*Quesnel*: The resurrection of Christ the greatest miracle, and the seal of His mission, 1 Cor. xv. 16.—The example of the Ninevites.—*Canstein*: Those who are nearest to the gospel often despise it most; but thereby they condemn themselves, so that they are without excuse, Heb. ii. 2.—*Hedinger*: Away, false security; though driven out, the devil may return in greater force.—Let him who has escaped take care lest he be ensnared again.—Those who invite the devil to take them, garnish the house of their heart for his reception.—The more frequently man resists the grace of God, the worse does he become, 2 Pet. ii. 22.

Lisco:—*The Ninevites*: There only a prophet, but here the Son of God Himself; there only a call to repentance, but here the announcement of mercy, and the gift of grace to repentance; there repentance, here impenitence, and hence the punishment which they escaped by their penitence, Luke xi. 32.—*The queen of the south*: She came from a far country, despite the difficulties in the way, while here they reject what is pressed on their acceptance; yonder longing and faith, here satiety and unbelief; yonder Solomon, here Christ, with His infinite wisdom.

Gerlach:—A man's words are the evidence on which he is to be tried before God.

Heubner:—One stronger must come, viz., Christ, by whom we can do all things.—Neutrality in matters of religion and of faith, will receive the severest condemnation.—Sin a poison.—The heart and the mouth cannot be separated.—The mouth betrays the heart.—An evil treasure a wretched possession.—A good treasure is inexhaustible.

[Wordsworth (on the sign of Jonah, ver. 39, 40):—Here is an observable instance of the uses of the Gospels in confirming the Old Testament. By this specimen of Divine exposition, our Lord suggests the belief, that whatever we may now find in the O. T. difficult to be understood, will one day be explained, and perhaps be seen to be prophetic and typical of the greatest mysteries of the gospel; and that in the mean time it is an exercise of their faith and a trial of their humility,—a divinely-appointed instrument of their moral probation. And it is *because* they are strange and marvellous, that such histories as those of Jonah and Balaam are the best tests of the strength of our faith.—P. S.]

---

4. *Even the mother and the brethren of Jesus now hesitate. But this hesitation affords the Lord an opportunity of calling attention to His spiritual and royal generation, in which they also were included.* Ch. XII. 46–50.

(Mark iii. 31–35; Luke viii. 19–21.)

46 While he yet talked to the people, behold, *his* mother and his brethren [brothers][1]
47 stood [were standing] without, desiring [seeking][2] to speak with him. Then one said

unto him, Behold, thy mother and thy brethren [brothers] stand without, desiring
48 [seeking] to speak with thee. But he answered and said unto him that told him, Who
49 is my mother? and who are my brethren [brothers]? And he stretched forth his hand
50 toward [upon, ἐπί] his disciples, and said, Behold my mother and my brethren! For
whosoever shall do the will of my Father which [who] is in heaven, the same is my
brother, and sister, and mother.

[1] Ver. 46.—[The E. Versions, from Wiclif's down to the Authorized, render ἀδελφοί: *brethren*, even where it signifies natural relationship, as here, Matt. i. 2 (Judah and his *brethren*); ii. 11; iv. 18; xiii. 55, and many other passages, so that the term *brothers* nowhere occurs in our Engl. Bible. But present usage confines the word *brethren* to moral and spiritual relationship. Worcester: "The word *brothers* denotes persons of the same family; the word *brethren* persons of the same society; but the latter is now little used, except in theology or in the solemn style."—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 46.—[Ζητοῦντες. Lange adds in small type: *with vain effort*. Comp. Luke viii. 19, who says, they "could not come at him for the press."—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 46. **While He yet talked to the people** (multitudes, ὄχλοις), etc.—The transaction probably occurred at Capernaum, in some public place near to a synagogue (Mark iii. 20, 21). The words, **they were standing without,** only imply that the Lord was surrounded by a dense crowd of people, and that His mother and brothers stood outside of it. But it clearly shows that Christ was not in a house. His mother and His brothers now appear, seeking in vain to speak to Him. The event is more fully recorded in the Gospel according to Mark. The occasion was as follows: The news spread through Capernaum with great rapidity, that Jesus had, in presence of all the people, broken with the pharisaical party; that He had been condemned by His enemies, against whom He had denounced the most awful judgments, and who were now encompassing His death. The crowd of heartless, worldly-wise politicians would add, in the complacency of their own wisdom, that it was madness to risk such a conflict. Probably it was soon suggested that He must be beside Himself. These reports would speedily reach His family, and alarm them not a little. We may either assume that they were now really staggered as to His position, and that they really believed that He was beside Himself, and that it was their duty to prevent further exposures (Olshausen). But in that case, their state of mind were deplorable indeed. On the other hand, however, we may also assume that from prudential motives they pretended to credit the popular rumor, in order, under this pretext, to withdraw Him from a danger which in their judgment He did not sufficiently appreciate. In our opinion, there are sufficient grounds for adopting the latter view. They do not press through the crowd, nor lay violent hands on Him; they send a respectful message, and patiently await His answer. Besides, we find that some time afterward the brothers of Jesus are not of opinion that He should not work at all, but rather ask Him to transfer the scene of His operations from Galilee to Judea, and openly to come forward before all the world (John vii. 1, etc.). In this light the conduct of His family must be viewed. Their unbelief consists not in doubting Him, but in imagining that it was theirs to preserve and direct Him by their worldly policy. Meyer is therefore mistaken when he maintains that the mother of Jesus was, at the time, not decided in her faith. Such instances as the later suggestion of His brothers (John vii. 1), the history of Peter (Matt. xvi. 33), that of Thomas (John xx.), nay, that of all the disciples, prove that during the period of spiritual development prior to the Feast of Pentecost, there were seasons when even believers might for a time be unbelieving, *i. e.*, self-willed, and deficient in the spirit of full surrender to Christ. The announcement of the mother of Jesus led to that exclamation of a woman in the crowd recorded in Luke xi. 27. Manifestly the circumstances are identical—in both cases we have the simile about this generation, and the demand of a sign. When, by His reply, *Who is My mother?* Christ had overcome the temptation from that source, He was invited by one of the Pharisees, as stated in Luke xi. 37. The situation is explained in the Gospel of Mark. The crowd was so great, that there was no leisure so much as to eat bread (ch. iii. 20); or, as we understand it, quietly to return to His home. A Pharisee, whose house was close at hand, took occasion to invite the Lord,—no doubt with a malicious purpose. No sooner had Christ sat down, than the Pharisee immediately reproached Him with omitting the customary washings. Probably the Pharisees present at the meal were desirous of employing this opportunity for their wicked devices against the Saviour. But the Lord addressed them in language of even more solemn and conclusive warning (Luke xi. 39)—the main ideas being afterward further developed and applied in His last address to the Pharisees at Jerusalem. In the midst of these machinations of His enemies, vast multitudes of people gather around (ch. xii. 1); Jesus is soon restored to His disciples; He continues His warning address against the Pharisees; and having refused a request to settle a dispute about an inheritance (ch. xii. 13), He betakes Himself to the shore of the lake, where He delivers (at least some of) His parables concerning the kingdom of heaven (Matt. xiii.).

Ver. 47. **Thy mother and thy brothers.**—Meyer holds that the latter expression implies that they were His uterine brothers; but an analogous argument might be derived from the term, father, in Luke ii. 48. The only legitimate inference from the Jewish use of language is, that they were His legal brothers, no matter whether they were uterine or merely adoptive brothers. For the arguments in favor of the latter view, we refer to the article *Jacobus*, in Herzog's *Real Encyclop.**

* [There are not two, but three different views on the four brothers of Christ, James, Joseph, Simon, and Judas (sisters also are mentioned, Matt. xiii. 56): 1, *children of Joseph* by a *former* marriage, and hence *older half-brothers* of Jesus. So the oldest Greek tradition. 2, *children of Joseph and Mary*, and hence *younger full-brothers* of Jesus. So Tertullian, Helvidius (who already produced Matt. i. 18, 24, 25; Luke ii. 7, and other arguments in favor of this view, but was violently assailed by Jerome (*see* my *History of the Christian Church*, vol. ii., p. 231), and a number of modern Protestant divines, as Herder, Stier, Neander, Winer, etc.; 3, *children of a sister* of the Virgin Mary, and hence only *cousins* of Jesus. So Jerome, the Roman Catholic and many Protestant commentators, among whom are Olshausen and

Ver. 49. **Upon (ἐπί) His disciples.**—Here the disciples in the wider sense. Jesus here places spiritual above carnal ties. His relatives are set aside, in as far as, for the moment, they had turned from the obedience of discipleship; but they are included, in as far as, by grace, they are enabled to stand fast in this temptation. Thus the Lord guards His position, the sanctity of His calling, and the holy effect of this grand moment, which would have been destroyed by worldly prudence. At the same time, He also watches over the faith of His mother and of His disciples, and gives a living example how everything else is to be subordinate to the Divine calling. Bengel: *Non sprevit matrem, sed anteponit patrem.*—There is nothing in the text to warrant the supposition of Ebrard, that the announcement of His mother and brothers was made use of by some cunning enemies, in order to interrupt His denunciations; nor in that of Meyer, that in all probability Jesus did not admit them to His presence. But the latter critic is right in controverting the idea of Chrysostom, that this message was a piece of ostentation on the part of the relatives of Jesus. Lisco: Perhaps the presence of His family was announced for the purpose of showing that one who had such humble relatives could not be the Messiah. But we see nothing to warrant this view. Besides, the announcement was made at the request of the mother of Jesus.

Ver. 50. [**The same is my brother, and sister, and mother.**—Note, that Christ does not introduce the term, *father*, since he had no human father. A hint of the mystery of the supernatural conception.—P. S.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. With the position here assigned to the mother of Jesus, we may contrast the decree of Pope Pius IX., A. D. 1854, about the Immaculate Conception of Mary. Like John the Baptist, she wavered—no doubt, partly from unbounded love to her Son; but, like him, she was upheld by the strong hand of Jesus. [ALFORD: "All these characteristics of the mother of our Lord are deeply interesting, both in themselves, and as building up, when put together, the most decisive testimony against the fearful superstition which has assigned to her the place of a goddess in the Romish mythology. Great and inconceivable as the honor of that meek and holy woman was, we find her repeatedly (*see* John ii. 4) the object of rebuke from her divine Son, and hear Him here declaring, that it is one which the humblest believer in Him has in common with her."—P. S.]

2. Gregory the Great: To announce the gospel is, so to speak, to become the mother of the Lord; for thus we bear Him anew. Comp. especially Rev. xii. 2. The Church, as bearing Christ. Every Christian, as priest, declaring Christ and bearing Him, figuratively the mother of Christ; as following Him, and manifesting the same mind, His brother; as receiving and receptive, His sister. But we must not press the symbolical interpretation. The terms, *mother*, *brother*, *sister*, signify the nearest relatives, the members of the spiritual family of Christ.

[Pope GREGORY says (*Moral. in Evang.*): "Qui Christi *frater* est *credendo*, *mater* efficitur *prædicando*; quasi enim parit eum quem in corde audientis infuderit." Compare also the remarks of CHRYSOSTOM: "How many women have blessed that holy virgin and her womb, and have desired to be such a mother as she was! What hinders them? Christ has made for us a wide way to this happiness: and not only women, but men may tread it; the way of *obedience*, this is it which makes such a mother—not the throes of parturition." WORDSWORTH: "There is but one true nobility, that of obedience to God. This is greater than that of the Virgin's relationship to Christ." MATTHEW HENRY: "All obedient believers are near akin to Jesus Christ. They wear His name, bear His image, have His nature, are of His family. He loves them, converses freely with them as his relations. He bids them welcome to His table, takes care of them, provides for them, sees that they want nothing that is fit for them; when He died, He left them rich legacies; now He is in heaven, He keeps up a correspondence with them, and will have them all to be with Him at last, and will in nothing fail to do the kinsman's part, nor will ever be ashamed of His poor relations, but will confess them before men, before the angels, and before His Father."—P. S.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Let us never imagine that we can preserve the cause of God by worldly policy.—Sad state of mind of those who fancy they must preserve the cause of God by worldly artifices or other worldly means (the staying of the ark, etc.). — The chosen handmaid wavering in the hour of temptation.—Wherein the natural kindred of Jesus differ from His spiritual family. 1. According to His human descent, He springs from the former; according to His Divine dignity and mission, the latter springs from Him. 2. The former may misunderstand Him; the latter is founded in knowledge of His glory. 3. The former was saved, as belonging to the latter; while the latter occupies a place of equal intimacy and affection with the former.—The Holy Family of Jesus.—Meekness of Jesus, in that He is willing to be born in the children of His Spirit.—*He that doeth the will of My Father*, etc.; or, the servant of God, Christ's kinsman.—Jesus the Saviour of Mary,—the Saviour of all the elect.—The Mighty One, who upholdeth all the wavering heroes of God.

Starke:—Friends and relatives are ofttimes in needless anxiety about those near and dear to them. —Public duty must always take precedence of domestic obligations.—We must not be detained or hindered by intercourse even with our best friends.—*Hedinger*:—We know not Christ after the flesh.—*Cramer*: By faith we are as closely related to Christ as if we were of His kindred.—*Osiander*: Man's highest nobility consists in having been born of God, and being the friend of Christ, 2 Pet. i. 4.

Gerlach:—The bonds of earthly affection must be renounced, if they stand in the way of the progress of the kingdom of God.

Heubner:—Care for relatives and nepotism have made more than one *Eli*, 1 Sam. iii. 13.—Behold how wide the heart of Jesus is!

Lange. The brothers of Jesus are mentioned in the following passages: Matt. xii. 46 (comp. Mark iii. 31; Luke viii. 19); Matt. xiii. 55, 56 (Mark vi. 3); John ii. 12; vii. 3, 5, 10; Acts i. 14; 1 Cor. ix. 5. I have discussed this difficult subject at length in my book on James, the brother of our Lord, Berlin, 1842. Comp. on the literature Winer sub *Jesus* and sub *Jacobus*, Meyer ad Matt. xii. 46 (p. 275), and my Exeget. Note on Matt. xiii. 55 below.—P. S.]

D. CHRIST MANIFESTS HIS ROYAL DIGNITY BY PRESENTING, IN SEVEN PARABLES, THE FOUNDING AND DEVELOPMENT OF HIS KINGDOM THROUGH ALL ITS PHASES, FROM ITS BEGINNING TO ITS END.

CHAPTER XIII. 1–51.

(Parallels: Mark iv. 1–20, 30–34; Luke viii. 4–15; xiii. 18–21.)

CONTENTS:—The parable of the sower; or, first parable concerning the kingdom of heaven: its institution by the Word. The teaching of Jesus concerning parables.—Second parable: the tares among the wheat; or, the seed of the Spirit and the heresies.—Third parable: the grain of mustard-seed; or, the spread of the Church.—Fourth parable: the woman and the leaven; or, the Christianization and evangelization of the world.—Fifth parable: the treasure hid in the field; or, invisible salvation hid within the visible Church.—Sixth parable: the pearl of great price; or, Christianity as the highest spiritual good in the world.—Seventh parable: the net full of fishes; or, the judgment which ushers in the manifestation of the kingdom of heaven.

EXEGETICAL NOTES ON THE WHOLE SECTION.

[LITERATURE ON THE PARABLES.—UNGER: *De parabolorum Jesu natura, interpretatione, usu*, Lips., 1828. F. G. LISCO: *The Parables of Jesus*, Berlin, 1831, and later. ARNDT: *The Parables of Jesus Christ* (16 Meditations), Magdeb., 1842. E. GRESWELL: *Exposition of the Parables and of other parts of the Gospels*, Lond., 1839, vols. 6. RICHARD CHENEVIX TRENCH (now archbishop of Dublin): *Notes on the Parables of our Lord*, 9th ed., Lond., 1863 (a former edition reprinted in New York). A very useful and deservedly popular book. Special introductory essays on the Parable by Dr. LANGE in Herzog's *Encycl.*, sub *Gleichniss* vol. v., p. 182 sqq., and another in Schneider's *Deutsche Zeitschrift für christl. Wissenschaft*, etc., for 1856; by Card. WISEMAN in his Misc. Essays; by Dr. GERHART in the "Mercersburg Review," etc. Among the commentators of the Gospels, OLSHAUSEN and STIER (*Words of Jesus*) are especially rich on the Parables. For older works on the Parables and the exposition of *particular* Parables, see DANZ and WINER in their *Manuals of Theol. Liter.*, sub verbo *Parabel*; HEUBNER: *Comment. on Matthew*, p. 181; and TRENCH: *Notes*, etc., pp. 494 and 495 (6th Lond. ed.).—P. S.]

1. The Evangelist Matthew combines the seven parables of the Lord concerning the development of the kingdom of heaven into a connected series, and at first sight creates the impression that they were uttered on the same day. But we must remember, that on that day Jesus had already been engaged in another great work, and that Matthew himself intimates at least two distinct pauses between the different parables (comp. Mark iv. 10). But according to Mark (iv. 1 seq.; comp. ver. 35 and Matt. viii. 18 seq.), three of these parables—that of the sower, that of the grain of mustard-seed, and between them the beautiful parable concerning the natural growth of the seed—had been taught by Jesus at an earlier period, viz., on the day when He passed over to Gadara and calmed the storm. Luke records the parable of the sower together with the calming of the storm at sea somewhat later (Luke viii. 5 seq.; 22 seq.; comp. Matt. viii. 23 seq.). Hence we must not look here for a strict chronological succession, while from the definite notices of Mark we infer that some of these parables had been uttered at an earlier period. But Matthew had good internal reasons for the pragmatic unity of his narrative. Foremost among these is the motive which induced the Lord to choose the parabolical form of teaching. This motive, which had appeared at an earlier stage of this history, became a distinct and avowed principle of action when the enmity of the Pharisees and of the people broke forth in an undisguised manner, and forced Him to come out with the full doctrine concerning the kingdom of God; while at the same time, on account of the spiritual decay of the people, it could be set forth only in the form of parables. Another motive which helped to determine the arrangement adopted by Matthew, was the close internal affinity of these seven parables, although we cannot, with Meyer, regard it as necessarily implying chronological succession. The greater part of them were, no doubt, delivered on one and the same day; and it is quite possible that Jesus, for the sake of their connection, again repeated on this occasion the parables which He had previously spoken.

2. The omission of the particle δέ serves to give additional force to the expression in ver 1. For, in this case we have not merely a historical continuation; the term implies that on that day the Lord fully adopted the parabolic mode of teaching

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL IDEAS ON THE PARABLES.

1. THE PARABLES OF CHRIST.—As parables were one of the forms in which the Lord conveyed His doctrine, they should, in the first place, be studied in connection with His other methods of teaching. The first and most direct of these was the simple *declaration* or *preaching* of the gospel, which accompanied the *facts* of the gospel—such as the proclamation of the kingdom of God, of forgiveness of sins, the call to discipleship, the bestowal of a new name, or of power and authority, special promises, special injunctions, etc. When addressed to a sympathetic audience, this declaration of the gospel was delivered in a regular, didactic manner, in the form of maxims, or gnomes—as, for example, the Sermon on the Mount. The use of *proverbs*, *gnomes*, or *sententious maxims* (*παροιμία*, *proverbium*, מָשָׁל, which, however, may also denote a parable), was a favorite mode of teaching among the Jews, after the example of Solomon in the Book of Proverbs. The *proverb* is a short, epigrammatic, pointed sentence, frequently figurative and concrete, occasionally paradoxical and

hyperbolical, at other times poetical, but always vivid and sharply outlined, so as to present in a transparent and significant form a deep, rich, and pregnant idea, which shines in the light of truth and burns in the fire of personal application—bright and brilliant like a true gem. But in dealing with individuals, the Saviour made use of the didactic *dialogue* (instead of the formal declaration), which in the presence of His intimate disciples assumed the form of the most direct *address*, at once instructing the mind and moving the heart. So especially in the parting discourses of the Saviour as recorded by St. John. When, on the other hand, those before Him were either strangers to His word or prejudiced against it, the heavenly Teacher made use of *similitudes* or *parables*. Under special circumstances, these were extended into *parabolical discourses*,—*i. e.*, discourses which assumed the form of parables, or parables to which the interpretation was added. Lastly, when confronted by enemies and accusers, Christ adopted the method of *questioning* (disputation), following it up by a warning, or by what would serve to silence an opponent—the ultimate mode of dealing with such persons being either open rebuke, or else solemn testimony. Finally, His *silence* also should be ranked among the forms of His teaching—viewing, as we do, each of them not merely as a speech, but as a *fact*.

The object of the parables, therefore, was to present the truth, more especially the doctrine of Christ concerning the kingdom of heaven, as in all its phases in direct opposition to the popular prejudices of the Jews, yet in a manner adapted to the weak understanding of a people ruled by these errors.

The use of parables for conveying instruction was very common among Eastern nations generally, and more particularly among the Jews (*see* Judges ix. 7; 2 Sam. xii. 1; Isa. v. 1; Unger, *de Parabolarum Jesu natura, interpretatione, usu*, Lips. 1828). The parable is a species of figurative speech, מָשָׁל (which, however, comprises with the full parable also the parabolic sentence and the gnome). Unger defines a parable as "*collatio, per narratiunculam fictam, sed veri similem, serio illustrans rem subliniorem.*" Meyer regards it as "the narrative of a fictitious but common and natural occurrence, for the purpose of embodying and illustrating some doctrine." But in treating of the parables of Scripture, it is not sufficient to enumerate only these outward characteristics, more especially as in the Gospel of John the outward and visible order of things is throughout employed as the transparent symbol of the invisible world, or of the kingdom of heaven. This mode of teaching itself must have had some special meaning and object, and convey some evangelical truth. The parable is a distinct outward reflection of spiritual life, under the form of a scene taken from real and everyday life, which, besides its primary object of embodying some particular lesson, also conveys the general truth, that spiritual life is capable of being symbolized and reflected.* The real, though figurative, relations subsisting between the outer and the inner, the lower and the higher life, suggest the elements from which the didactic and poetic parables were constructed, which in turn were either extended into parabolic discourses (or gave rise to them), or else summed up in parabolic expressions. To illustrate this, we submit the following Table:—

* [Dr. TRENCH, in the General Introduction to his *Notes on the Parables*, instead of adding another to the many definitions of the parable already given by the Greek fathers (comp. SUICER: *Thesaurus s. v.* παραβολή), by Jerome, by Bengel, Unger, Teelmann, and other modern writers, prefers to explain its nature by noting the differences of the parable from the *fable*, the *myth*, the *proverb*, and the *allegory*. Dr. ALFORD likewise briefly distinguishes the parable from these kindred forms of composition, and then defines the parable, similarly as Unger and Meyer, to be "*a serious narration, within the limits of probability, of a course of action pointing to some moral or spiritual Truth.*"—P. 8.]

(1.) *Constituent Elements of Parables; or Parables in the narrowest sense.*

a. Τύπος.	*b.* Σύμβολον.	*c.* Ἀλληγορία.
The outline, archetype, or model of some reality which was yet to appear. *Similitude of essence, difference of development, prototype of that which was to be developed and evolved.* Thus the ordinances and institutions of the Old Testament were, *in their inward essence*, types of the New Testament. Similarly, the first era serves as a type of the second.	The *equivalent, visible sign* of what is invisible. That which is outward a sign of that which is inward, and hence the lower a sign of the higher. *Similitude of mode and form, difference as to the stage of life, emblem of what is higher.* Thus the *outward* rite is a symbol of the inner life.	*The mark and indication of outward similarity*, or also of the internal relationship and connection of things. *A counterpart and reappearance* of what has the same shape and form, either in the world of matter or of mind. Thus *the serpent was an allegory of Satan.*

(2.) *The Didactic and Poetic Parables.*

(With these the strictly poetical form of parables should be conjoined, if they had a place here.)

a The *Typical* Parable.	*b.* The *Symbolical* Parable.	*c.* The *Allegorical* Parable.
The sacraments of the New Testament as marking the great outlines of the kingdom of heaven. The Church as a type of the kingdom of God. Representation of the state of future perfectness in the first sketch and plan, or when commencing to carry the scheme into execution.	The parables of the Lord (the παραβολή), even philologically akin to the σύμβολον. (In some of their phases allegorical; for example, the tares.) Exhibition of spiritual transactions and facts in the description (not fiction) of scenes and events taken from everyday life.	Used only in certain aspects, and for the purpose of supplementing the symbolical parables, as in God's world and in reality evil can only exist in allegorical signs of outward *appearance*, not in symbolical signs of wicked *subsistence*. Hence also the Apocalypse deals most largely in allegories. In secular poetry the allegorical element is chiefly embodied in the form of fables. The only expression in the N. T. reminding us of this style of composition, is the allusion of the Saviour to Herod: *Tell that fox.*

(3.) *The Parabolical Discourses;* or, Extended and Applied Similitudes.

(*i. e.*, Figurative discourses, in which parables are conjoined with their interpretation, or application, or with some doctrinal statement; as, for example, in Matt. vii. 24; xi. 16.)

a. Typical Parabolical Discourse.

Figurative anticipation of full development and completion when only the principle of it exists, *e. g.:* "The blind see," etc.—"The dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God," John v. 25.—"Whoso eateth My flesh," etc., John vi. 54.

b. Symbolical Parabolical Discourse.

The sayings and discourses recorded by John concerning the Israelite without guile, the temple, the new birth, the brazen serpent, the fountain, the manna, the vine, the good shepherd, etc.

c. Allegorical Parabolical Discourse.

The sending forth among wolves, the corrupt tree, etc.

(4.) *The Parabolical Expressions;* or, Rhetorical and Figurative Allusions.

a. The typical parabolical expression, or *Synecdoche;* or, used and viewed with reference to form, the *Metonymy.* The hairs of your head are "numbered." Bethsaida, Capernaum, the land of Sodom.—"I am the resurrection."

b. The symbolical parabolical expression, or *Metaphor.*—"What I tell you in darkness, that speak ye in light." Preaching upon the house-tops.

c. The allegorical parabolical expression, or the simple *rhetorical figure*, and figurative comparison.—"As a thief in the night."

2. Object of the Use of Parables.—According to the modern view, our Lord had recourse to parables for the *exclusive* purpose of presenting the truth in a form adapted to the weak and carnal understanding of a people which otherwise could not have grasped it. Then the parables would be merely a popular mode of teaching. But the explanations of their object furnished by the Lord Himself (Matt. xiii. 13; Mark iv. 11; Luke viii. 10) go far beyond this pedagogical view of the subject. "Therefore," He says, "speak I to them in parables, because seeing they see not, and hearing they hear not, neither do they understand." This perhaps might be regarded as indicating that the only object of Christ was to render His doctrine more plain and easily intelligible. But, on the other hand, the reference to Isa. vi. 9, 10, which speaks of the hardening of the people under the preaching of the prophet, and which our Lord declares was being then fulfilled; the declaration of blessedness in regard to the disciples, to whom the Master could interpret these parables; and, lastly, the use of ἵνα in Mark and Luke (*that*, or *in order that*, seeing they may not see), instead of the ὅτι of our Gospel,—show that the motive of the Saviour in making use of parables was more deep and solemn than the above theory implies. It was certainly in judgment that He could not set before the Jews the bare and undisguised truth concerning His kingdom. Still, it was not primarily intended as a judicial blinding, but in order to present the truth in a form accessible to the senses, which would at the same time serve both to conceal and to reveal it, according to the state of the hearers; or, in other words, to present the truth in such a coloring as the diseased vision of the people alone could bear. Unbelievers would not so readily elicit the spiritual truth from this symbolic form, and hence not so easily pervert it to their own condemnation. Accordingly, while this mode of teaching was in itself a judgment, it was also combined with mercy, since it averted from them the doom of hardening themselves under the truth. It was impossible, moreover, to found and prefer charges of heresy against His teaching when propounded in that manner, even although hostile hearers might have comprehended its import (*see* ch. xxi. 45). On the other hand, those of the people who were susceptible would be enabled more and more clearly to gather the spiritual truth when conveyed in this transparent form. Indeed, Matt. xiii. 35 shows that such was one of the objects which the Saviour had in view; while Mark iv. 33 pointedly indicates the fact, that Jesus chose a form adapted to all His hearers, and to both parties, in order to set before them the doctrine concerning the kingdom of heaven. The parables of the Lord were an exhibition of the spiritual history of His kingdom, presented in pictures and figures derived from the things of this world. Even this continual comparing of the kingdom with the things of time and of sense, must have shown the people that the kingdom itself was not of this world. Finally, the parables of the Saviour resemble His miracles, in that, on the one hand, they exhibit the power of the kingdom of heaven in a variegated and striking light, while on the other they present it, as it were, in broken rays and isolated facts and events.

3. The Parables of the Lord in their connection.

(1.) The key and introduction to the seven opening parables *concerning the progress and development* of the kingdom of God in general (Matt. xiii.), is found in an eighth parable, recorded by Mark (iv. 26), which is intended to show the fixed law and regularity of this spiritual development.

(2.) The parables concerning *the compassion and mercy by which the kingdom of God is founded* (as opposed to the prejudices of the Jews).—*a.* Misunderstanding and misapplication of mercy and compassion leads to judgment. 1. Misunderstanding and misapplication of the blessing of God; or, the folly of the rich man, Luke xii. 16. 2. Misunderstanding and misapplication of the long-suffering of God; or, the barren fig tree, Luke xiii. 6.—*b. Pure compassion, divine or human*, but especially the compassion of Christ: the good Samaritan.—*c.* Compassion turning away from the blinded (the guests who had been invited), and turning to the poor and needy: the great supper, Luke xiv. 15; mercy and judgment as ap-

pearing in the figurative narrative of the supper. Accordingly, this parable forms a transition to the exhibition of *divine mercy.*—*d. Saving mercy.* It discerns the wretched state of the lost; but at the same time also discovers a value attaching to them, derived from the bestowal of mercy upon them. The lost sheep; the lost piece of money; the lost son, Luke xv. *The conditions of mercy. Repentance, humility:* the Pharisee and the publican, Luke xviii. 9–14. *The delays and answers of mercy;* its demand: prayer. The working and wrestling of genuine faith (Luke xviii. 1–8; comp. Luke xi. 5–8: the call and demand made upon the friend at night). *Evidence of the experience of grace.* The blessing attaching to mercifulness; or, the unjust steward, Luke xvi. 1. The judgment pronounced upon unmercifulness,—*presented in a negative form* (worldly unmercifulness *): the rich man, Luke xvi. 19;—*presented in a positive form* (spiritual unmercifulness, sanctimonious uncharitableness, harsh judgments): the *harsh* servant, Matt. xviii. 23.

(3.) *Retributive justice* as directing the *administration* of the kingdom of God.—The one penny to each of the laborers in the vineyard; or, the reward *as of free grace* (Matt. xx. 1). The ten servants and the ten talents; or, the Lord as a trader during His absence from the city, and during its revolt; or, the reward of *quiet, persevering faithfulness,* as contrasted with the punishment of unfaithfulness during the revolt of the world, on which judgment descends (Luke xix. 11). The three servants, and *the blessing attaching to the faithful use of the gifts entrusted to us,* as contrasted with the curse attaching to the misapplication of gifts and talents (Matt. xxv. 14–30).

(4.) *The judgments which complete and usher in the kingdom of God.*—*a.* Mercy *and judgment.* Under the figure of the marriage feast, Matt. xxii. 1. The two sons of the owner of the vineyard, Matt. xxi. 28. The unfaithful husbandmen, Matt. xxi. 33. The foolish and the wise virgins, Matt. xxv. 1–13.—*b. Final judgment* upon the ministry of the word, or the evil servant, Matt. xxiv. 48. *c.* Final judgment upon the nations. Mercy presiding even on that awful occasion,—presented in the form of a parable, Matt. xxv. 31.

"Here, at the climax of all the parables of the New Testament, we see the bud of the parabolical form of teaching opening up and disclosing the beauteous flower which it had enclosed. The manifestation and appearance of the kingdom of God is now clearly and undisguisedly presented, although the manifold symbolical outlines by which it is surrounded show that this section embodies only the climax of all the parables." Lange, *Leben Jesu.*

Another point deserves special mention. The parables of the Lord all pointedly exhibit the contrast between the kingdom of Christ—its fundamental principle and laws—and the carnal notions of the Jews concerning the reign of the Messiah; more especially, the contrast between the free and universal grace of God, and the hierarchical and national conception of the Deity, and a partisan reign; between the apostasy of the Jews, and the faith of publicans and sinners, and even of Gentiles; between the Church and the world; the external and the internal Church; the children of outward forms, and those of the spirit; between the judgment passed by the Master upon spiritual pride, self-righteousness, uncharitableness, sanctimonious harshness and rigorism of doctrine, and the gracious salvation accorded to humility, to believing service, to endurance, to love, and to gentleness.

4. THE SEVEN PARABLES WHICH TREAT OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD, MATT. XIII.—It will readily be perceived that these parables exhibit the entire development of the kingdom of God in its leading outlines, from the commencement to the close of it. The first parable treats of the institution of the kingdom of God, and the last, of its completion on earth by the final judgment; while the five intermediate parables successively mark its progress: the wheat among the tares; the grain of mustard seed among the trees; the leaven leavening the whole lump; the treasure *found* in the field; the kingdom of heaven as the pearl of great price.*

At the same time, each of these parables forms in itself a complete and independent section,—like all the other doctrinal portions of Scripture, and especially the various prophetic sketches in Isaiah and in the Book of Revelation. Still, under every new phase as it emerges in each of these parables, the kingdom and its history are presented from another aspect, and in a new form, marking its onward progress from the commencement to the completion. If parables present the ideal phases in the development of the kingdom of heaven, we shall naturally expect that they also bear reference to the historical succession of the different forms through which the visible Church has passed. Accordingly, we cannot fail to trace in the parable of the sower a picture of the apostolic age; in the parable of the tares, the ancient Catholic Church spring-

* [The Edinb. trsl. has here: "*what* unmercifulness," from the first edition of Lange: "*welche* Unbarmherzigkeit," which is an evident misprint for *weltliche*, as opposed to the following "*geistliche* Unbarmherzigkeit."—P. S.]

* [ALFORD: "The seven parables related in this chapter cannot be regarded as a collection made by the evangelist as relating to one subject, the Kingdom of Heaven and its development; they are clearly indicated by ver. 53 to have been all spoken on *one and the same occasion*, and form indeed a complete and glorious whole in their inner and deeper sense. The *first four* of these parables appear to have been spoken *to the multitude from the ship;* the *last three, to the disciples in the house.*" D. BROWN: "These parables are SEVEN in number; and it is not a little remarkable that while this is the *sacred number*, the first FOUR of them were spoken to the mixed multitude, while the remaining THREE were spoken to the Twelve in private—these divisions, *four* and *three*, being themselves notable in the symbolical arithmetic of Scripture. Another thing remarkable in the structure of these parables is, that while the first of the seven—that of the Sower—is of the nature of an introduction to the whole, the remaining six consist of *three pairs*—the second and seventh, the third and fourth, and the fifth and sixth, corresponding to each other; each pair setting forth the same general truths, but with a certain diversity of aspect. All this can hardly be accidental."—Observe also the natural and easy transition in the order of the seven parables, from the sower and the good seed to the enemy and the tares among the wheat; from the sown field to the mustard seed and mighty tree, from the external growth of the plant to the internal growth and process of penetration and assimilation; then to the treasure in the field, suggested by the seed buried in the ground, from the lucky discoverer to the earnest seeker and finder, from the treasure to the precious pearl, the treasure of the deep; which suggests the sea, the fishermen with their net, the mixed crowd on the beach, the final separation and consummation. Thus from the first sowing of Christianity in the days of Christ and the apostles to the general judgment we have one continued process of growth and development of good and bad, Christ and Anti-Christ (wheat and tares), external and internal (mustard seed and leaven), finding without seeking (the treasure in the field), and seeking and finding (the pearl of great price), and a continuous partial judgment and separation—since the history of the world and the church is *a* (not *the*) judgment of both—foreshadowing and ending at last in the final consummation on the banks of eternity (the parable of the net). All these processes go hand in hand and act and react one upon another, each period doing the same work under new aspects, with peculiar gifts, with fresh zeal and energy.—P. S.]

ing up in the midst of heresies; in the parable of the mustard bush, resorted to by the birds of the air as if it were a tree, and loaded with their nests, a representation of the secular state-Church under Constantine the Great; in the leaven that is mixed among the three measures of meal, the pervading and transforming influence of Christianity in the mediæval Church, among the barbarous races of Europe; in the parable of the treasure in the field, the period of the Reformation; in the parable of the pearl, the contrast between Christianity and the acquisitions of modern secular culture; and in the last parable, a picture of the closing judgment. These parables embody both the bright and the dark aspect of the history of the kingdom of heaven; while the seven beatitudes reflect the light (being primarily a delineation of the ideal progress and advancement of believers), and the letters to the seven churches in the Book of Revelation, mainly the shadows of the final catastrophe, or of the coming judgment (being primarily a delineation of the seven churches of Asia Minor). The subjoined table will serve to give a clearer view of this:

1. The poor in spirit: the kingdom of heaven.	1. The sower: the good field and the fruit.	1. *Ephesus.* Patience and perseverance *in the work* of faith. Deficiency in the *root* of the life of faith.
2. They that mourn: comfort.	2. The wheat among the tares.	2. *Smyrna.* Rich and flourishing, by the side of the synagogue of Satan.
3. The meek: possession of the earth.	3. The grain of mustard seed grown into a tree.	3. *Pergamos.* Hath held fast amidst martyrdom. Dwelleth where Satan's seat is (in the world). Balaamites or Nicolaitanes: combination of Christianity with the lust of the world.
4. Hungering and thirsting after righteousness: being filled.	4. The leaven put among the three measures of meal.	4. *Thyatira.* Abundance of works. The woman Jezebel: a fanatical prophetess committing fornication with the world.
5. The merciful: obtaining of mercy.	5. The treasure found in the field.	5. *Sardis.* Hath a name that it liveth, and is dead. A few names in Sardis, which have not defiled their garments, walk with the Lord in white.
6. The pure in heart: vision of God.	6. The pearl of great price: sought and obtained at great sacrifice.	6. *Philadelphia.* An open door. A little strength. Kept the word. Victorious over many of the synagogue of Satan.
7. The peacemakers: dignity of the children of God.	7. The net drawn out of the sea: separation of the good and the bad fishes.	7. *Laodicea.* Neither cold nor hot. "I will spue thee out of My mouth. Be zealous and repent. Behold, I stand at the door."

We do not mean to say, however, that the ideal progression in these parables fully reflects the historical succession of the principal phases in the history of the kingdom of God; it only delineates its general outlines.

All the seven parables, then, are intended to represent, in regular succession, the development of the kingdom of heaven in its conflict with and victory over the opposition of the world, and in its hidden character as contrasted with the Jewish notions of the reign of Messiah. Hence in each of the parables the lights and shadows of the kingdom of heaven are brought out. These shadows are, in the first parable, the three varieties of bad soil; in the second, the enemy, the tares, and the indiscriminating zeal of the servants; in the third, the mistake of treating a large garden plant as if it had been a forest tree, and the lodging of the birds in its branches (regarding and treating the kingdom of heaven as if it had been a worldly kingdom); in the fourth, the mixing up and the hiding of the leaven in the meal; in the fifth, the concealment of the treasure; in the sixth, the seeming disappearance of the pearl of great price in the hands of the merchants, and among other pearls; and in the seventh, the mixing up of the good fish with the bad, and with other foul breed of the sea. On the other hand, the bright side of the picture, in the first parable, is the rich field waving with fruit; in the second, the wheat outgrowing the tares; in the third, the wonderful upshooting of the grain of mustard seed; in the fourth, the leaven acting as a stronger power, pervading and affecting by its unseen efficacy the three measures of meal—thus representing the influence of the divine life overcoming and transforming our old nature; in the fifth, the picture of the treasure *found*, and of the surrender of all other things for its possession; in the sixth, the picture of the pearl of great price, and of the ardent devotedness with which it is *sought* and procured; in the seventh, the picture of the good fish, and of the net now free from the encumbrance of the bad. In accordance with the structure and symbolical meaning of the number *seven*, we direct our attention, in the first place, to the first four parables. Here we observe that the first and second parables primarily delineate the immense obstacles which the kingdom of heaven has to encounter—negatively from want of susceptibility (the first parable), and positively from error, heresy, and offences (the second parable). The third and fourth parables form an antithesis to this description, and delineate the wonderful progress of the kingdom of heaven as it sweeps before it these obstacles. Thus the parable of the mustard seed brings out the marvellous growth of the kingdom—how it springs up and forces itself upon the observation of the men of the world, till

they even attempt to combine the Church with the world, and take their lodgment in it, just as if this garden plant had been any ordinary tree; while the parable of the leaven refers to the unseen, but all-powerful and all-transforming, efficacy of the gospel among the nations. If the first four parables present mainly the *objective* aspect of the kingdom of heaven, and the work of the Lord, of His servants and of His Church, the three last parables equally show the *subjective* bearing of the kingdom, or the action of believers. On this account the divine treasure is now represented as something which is there, but which must be sought and acquired. In the first of these parables the discovery appears as a happy incident, or rather as a free gift of Providence—the treasure being hidden; while in the second it is presented as the result of conscious higher aspirations, which must be regarded as being in themselves, though not consciously, Christian, the treasure being concentrated, as it were, into one pearl of infinite value. The last parable is again prevailingly objective in its bearing. It treats of the judgment, when the kingdom, falsely expected by the Jews in connection with the first coming of the Messiah, comes out in its full light and glory. Finally, if, according to the analogy of the first beatitude in the Sermon on the Mount, we regard the first parable as the basis of all the rest, the other six parables form an antithesis; the first three tracing the manifestation of the kingdom of heaven in the visible Church, and the last three delineating the hidden Christianity of the invisible Church. This invisible aspect of the kingdom of heaven corresponds, as we might have expected, with the great element of subjective faith and striving, and with its final triumph (comp. the exegetical notes on ver. 44).

Throughout all these parables, however, the progress of the inward form of the kingdom of heaven is also clearly marked. In the first parable, the seed is the direct preaching of the gospel; in the second, it is sound doctrine in opposition to the noxious weeds of heresy; in the third, a Christian confession, and a professing community of Christians; in the fourth, Christianity as the spirit of life, and the power of regeneration; in the fifth, saving truth in its grand, all-comprehensive principle (Christ for us); in the sixth, the spiritual treasure in its highest and clearest concentration—the love and peace of Christ, or Christ in us; and in the seventh, the final result of all history and of the judgment—the heavenly feast.

HOMILETICAL HINTS ON THE WHOLE SECTION.

The wisdom of Jesus as a Teacher.—The words of the Lord "like apples of gold in pictures of silver."—The parables of the Lord are gospel to the poor, even so far as their popular form is concerned.—Object of the parabolical mode of teaching: both judgment and mercy.—The parabolical discourse, a repetition and revisal of the revelation of God, which man had forgotten. 1. At first God revealed Himself to man by the parable of creation, and by special parables connected with it, but after that by the word; 2. man made an idol of the parable itself, and thereby came into opposition with the word; 3. Christ now shows again to man the *word* in the parables, in order to reclaim him for the spirit of His word.—The truth obliged, in compassion, to disguise itself in the form of parables in the presence of its children.—The gospel a fruit of the tree of life, both as to its kernel, and as to its husk.—The seven parables concerning the development of the kingdom of heaven prefaced by the parable concerning the fixed rule of this development (Mark iv. 26).—The seven leading phases of the kingdom of God.—The seven forms of human economy which portray the economy of God: the sower; field-servants; husbandry; the mistress of the house preparing bread; the farmer; the merchantman; the fisherman.—Import of the fact, that in these seven parables the Lord brings out with increasing distinctness the province and activity of man in the kingdom of God.—How the treasure of the kingdom of God is increasingly to assume a more definite form in our minds.—How it is ultimately to be transformed into the pearl of great price.—We ourselves attain value in the sight of God by finding the pearl of great price.

---

1. *First Parable concerning the kingdom of heaven, and teaching of Jesus concerning Parables generally.*
Ch. XIII. 1–23.

1, 2 The same day[1] went Jesus out of the house, and sat by the sea side. And great
multitudes were gathered together unto him, so that he went into a ship, and sat [down];
3 and the whole multitude stood on the shore. And he spake many things unto them in
4 parables, saying, Behold, a sower went forth to sow; And when [as] he sowed, some
5 *seeds* fell by the way side, and the fowls came and devoured them up: Some [And others,
ἄλλα δὲ] fell upon stony [rocky] places, where they had not much earth: and forthwith
6 they sprung up, because they had no deepness [depth] of earth: And when the sun was
7 up, they were scorched; and because they had no root, they withered away. And
8 some [others] fell among thorns; and the thorns sprung up, and choked them: But
other fell into [on the] good ground, and brought forth fruit, some a hundredfold, some
9 sixtyfold, some thirtyfold. Who hath ears to hear, let him hear.
10 And the disciples came, and said unto him, Why speakest thou unto them in para-
11 bles? He answered and said unto them, Because it is given unto you to know the

12 **mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but to them it is not given. For whosoever hath,**
to him shall be given, and he shall have more abundance:[2] but whosoever hath not,
13 from him shall be taken away even that he hath.[3] Therefore speak I to them in para-
bles: because they seeing [seeing they] see not; and hearing they hear not, neither do
14 they understand. And in them is fulfilled the prophecy of Esaias [Isaiah], which saith,
By hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and shall
15 not perceive: For this people's heart is waxed gross, and *their* ears are dull of hearing,
and their eyes they have closed; lest at any time they should see with *their* eyes, and
hear with *their* ears, and should understand with *their* heart, and should be converted,
16 and I should [shall] heal them.[4] But blessed *are* your eyes, for they see: and your
17 ears, for they hear. For verily I say unto you, That many prophets and righteous *men*
have desired to see *those things* which ye see, and have not seen *them;* and to hear
those things which ye hear, and have not heard *them.*
18, 19 Hear ye therefore the parable of the sower.[5] When any one heareth the word of
the kingdom, and understandeth *it* not, then cometh the wicked [evil] one, and catch-
eth [snatcheth] away that which was sown in his heart. This is he which received
20 seed [he that is sown, ὁ . . σπαρείς] by the way side. But he that received the seed
[is sown] into stony [on the rocky] places, the same is he that heareth the word, and
21 anon [immediately, at once, εὐθύς] with joy receiveth it; Yet hath he not root in him-
self, but dureth for a while: for when tribulation or persecution ariseth because of the
22 word, by and by [immediately, εὐθύς] he is offended. He also that received seed [is
sown] among the thorns is he that heareth the word; and the care of this [the] world,[6]
23 and the deceitfulness of riches, choke the word, and he becometh unfruitful. But he
that received seed [is sown] into [on] the good ground is he that heareth the word, and
understandeth *it;* which also beareth fruit, and bringeth forth, some a hundredfold,
some sixty, some thirty.

[1] Ver. 1.—The particle δέ is wanting in B., Z., and A., and is omitted by Lachmann and Tischendorf. It weakens the stress laid upon the fact that Jesus on the same day changed his mode of teaching into that of parables before the people. [Cod. Sinaiticus likewise omits δέ.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 12.—[*More* is unnecessary. The Greek is simply: καὶ περισσευθήσεται, *and he shall be made to abound*, or *have abundance.* Comp. ch. xxv. 29.—P. S.]

[3] Ver. 12.—[According to the order of the original: *even what he hath, shall be taken from him.*]

[4] Ver. 15.—I *shall* heal them. The future ἰάσομαι for the conjunct. ἰάσωμαι, is supported by the best authorities, B., C., D., etc., Lachmann, Tischendorf. Comp. also Is. vi. 10 (*Sept.*). [*See* exeget. note to ver. 15, where the Edinb. trsl. erroneously has ἰάσωμαι for ἰάσομαι, in opposition to the explanation. Cod. Sinaiticus, as edited by Tischendorf, reads: ιασομε = ἰάσομαι.—P. S.]

[5] Ver. 18.—Lit.: *of him that sowed*, σπείραντος (Codd. B., X., etc., Lachm., Tischend.); not σπείροντος. So also ver. 24: σπείραντι. [Cod. Sinait. likewise reads σπείραντος.—P. S.]

[6] Ver. 22.—Lit.: *the* world; τούτου (*this*) being omitted in B., D., [Cod. Sinait.], Lachm., Tischend., and probably an explanatory addition by a later hand (Meyer).

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 2. **A ship.**—The ship being here analogous to "*the mountain.*" He **sat down,** while the people **stood** in a line along the shore or the beach (ἐπὶ τὸν αἰγιαλόν).

Ver. 3. [**By the wayside.**—"The ordinary roads or paths in the East lead often along the edge of the fields, which are unenclosed. . . . Hence as the sower scatters his seed, some of it is liable to fall beyond the ploughed portion, on the hard, beaten ground which forms the wayside." Dr. Hackett: *Illustrations of Scripture*, etc., p. 168.]

Ver. 5. **Rocky ground,** τὰ πετρώδη.—Not merely soil covered with stones, but *rocky* soil. Think of the terraces used for agricultural purposes in ancient Palestine. The cultivated soil terminated in the rocky abutments of the hills.

Ver. 6. Gerlach: "When the sun rose higher, after the winter was past." But the parable evidently refers to a very rapid withering.

Ver. 7. **Among thorns**;—literally, *upon* thorns, *i. e.*, upon soil from which thorns were springing. The expression refers to soil from which the thorns had not been removed, and not to thorn bushes.

Ver. 8. **A hundred fold,** etc.—Round parabolical numbers, to indicate the rich return of the seed, although the high computation is based on the fertility of Galilee, and of other districts in the East. For the monastic application of this passage by Jerome, *see* Heubner, p. 185.

Ver. 11. **It is given unto you.**—This, and what follows, is understood by Calvin to refer to the doctrine of decrees (Instit. iii. ch. 24, § 13). But Heubner objects, "(1) that ver. 12 points to a moral cause, existent in the Apostles; (2) that ver. 14 indicates that the blindness of the people was caused by their own guilt."—**The mysteries.**—The mysteries concerning the kingdom of heaven (the genitive being here that of the object) are mysteries to the natural man, whose mind is darkened by sin. This held true in an especial manner of the Jewish exclusiveness of those days, both as regards the *spirituality* of the kingdom of Christ, from which unbelieving Israel was excluded, and its *universality*, in which believing Gentiles were embraced. The passage may therefore be regarded as a first reference to the

"mystery" which Paul afterward declared had been specially intrusted to his ministry, Eph. iii. 4; Rom. xvi. 25. These mysteries the people could only bear in the form of parables; but to the disciples it was given of God, that Christ could, along with the parables, also grant them the interpretation; and that in increasing measure He could speak to them about these mysteries "plainly," and without parable or figures (John xvi. 29). The truth concerning the kingdom of heaven has, since the Fall, become a mystery to man, (1) by his guilt and self-delusion; (2) by the divine judgment of concealment. Hence the restoration of this knowledge is a revealing of mysteries, an ἀποκάλυψις.

Ver. 12. **Whosoever hath.**—A proverbial expression. "A rich man easily grows more wealthy, while the poor readily lose the little which they have." Meyer. The bearing of the first clause is sufficiently plain; but with reference to the second, the proverbial interpretation of Meyer is doubtful. Still more unsatisfactory is his explanation: "The people would lose even the limited amount of knowledge they possess, if I did not aid their capacities by the use of parables." The interpretation which would most readily occur to the reader is: By the use of parables the people lose even what they have, since they cannot readily perceive those mysteries when presented in that particular form. But, on the other hand, we may suggest that the word ἀρθήσεται does not necessarily mean "shall be taken away." The primary rendering of the verb αἴρειν is *to lift up*, or *to lift on high;* and then among other meanings it may also be rendered, to *take upon oneself*, to *preserve* or *keep.** And thus indeed it frequently happens that the little which a poor man hath is taken away from him, in the sense of being tutorially administered for his benefit. Whether this explanation be correct or not, such at least is the fact in reference to the present instance. The economy of tutors and governors is that form in which the truth requires to be disguised under legal ordinances and types, or, as in this case, under parables, in order that in this manner it may be *presented in a strange and external form*, and be *administered by others*, until gradually it comes to be *more fully understood.*

Ver. 13. **Because seeing,** *etc.*—The rendering of ὅτι by **because** is warranted by the use of ἵνα in the parallel passages in Mark and Luke.

Ver. 14. **Is fulfilled,** or rather, **is completely fulfilled** (ἀναπληροῦται).—A strong expression, not otherwise used by Matthew, put foremost in the sentence by way of emphasis. The quotation from Isa. vi. 9, 10, is made after the Septuagint. In the days of Isaiah it was in a certain sense fulfilled that the Jewish people had hardened itself under the preaching of the "Evangelist of the Old Testament." But this was most completely fulfilled when the Jews resisted the gospel itself. In this respect, therefore, the words of Isaiah were a typical prophecy of gospel times. But as this saying had in a conditional sense been formerly fulfilled, the Evangelist does not employ the simple verb πληροῦται, but the compound ἀναπληροῦται.

Ver. 15. **This people's heart is waxed gross,** ἐπαχύνθη.—Properly, *it became fat*, in a figurative sense—*i. e.*, their heart became carnal, and lost the spiritual life. The same process of carnalization took place with reference to their ears and their eyes, all spiritual life being surrendered, or rather, traditionalism transforming the things of the Spirit into a series of external, finite, and carnal ordinances. Their ears became dull of hearing, and their eyes they closed, covering them with a film, and thus depriving them of the power of vision. The same carnality extended through all the departments of spiritual life; their heart was dead to spiritual experience, their ear to spiritual obedience, and their eye to spiritual knowledge. It deserves special notice, that in the prophecies of Isaiah the passage reads, in the imperative spirit of the Old Testament: "*Make* the heart of this people fat, and *make* their ears heavy, and *shut* their eyes," while in the Gospels the Lord specially points to their own guilt in this judicial visitation. Every spiritual faculty in them had become gross, or rather, they had made it gross. Their eyes they have closed, ἐκάμμυσαν. The expression refers primarily to the shutting of the eyes, and, from a reference to the words of Isaiah, must be understood as implying a continuous and determined closing of the eyes against the light of truth.

Lest at any time, μήποτε.—This statement also must be read in the light of our former remarks. In the prophecy of Isaiah the result here mentioned is traced to the judicial purpose of God; in the text, to the determination or their own wicked hearts, eyes, and ears: They *will* not (comp. John v. 40), and therefore they *can* not. [Moral unwillingness resulting in moral inability.—P. S.] In this respect it deserves special notice that, according to the correct reading, the future tense, ἰάσομαι, is here used (as also in the Sept.), and not the conjunctive. Accordingly, the statement does not mean that they were not to obtain healing now, during this season of judgment, but only, that they had prevented the healing which would otherwise have been accorded to them. This, indeed, implies that the people were actually under the judicial dispensation of God—a state of things which the Lord admitted by His use of parables; so that it was not quite so simple a process as Meyer supposes, nor merely designed for educational purposes (comp. also Acts xiii. 46; xxvi. 27; Rom. x.; 2 Cor. iii. 14). But the object in view seems to have been as follows: Those who were aroused by the parables would progress and inquire, as the disciples inquired; while those who were ready to harden themselves would be preserved from suddenly incurring that awful guilt which the full disclosure of the mysteries of the kingdom would have entailed.

Ver. 16. **But your eyes, blessed are they.**—Mark the peculiar emphasis of the ὑμῶν δὲ, etc. *Blessed are the eyes.* A concrete mode of expression, alluding to the fact that their outward vision was inspired and directed by their spiritual sight, in opposition to these who were destitute of spiritual vision, Acts v. 9; Isa. lii. 7.

Ver. 17. **Many prophets and righteous men.**—The δίκαιοι are the Old Testament saints, who were not only blameless "as concerning the law," but who, like the prophets, looked and longed for a higher and better than this external righteousness. They only aspired to an ἰδεῖν, not a βλέπειν; but even this they did not obtain in the same measure as the disciples,

* [Dr. Lange has here in view no doubt the threefold meaning of the corresponding German verb *aufheben*, which plays such an important part in the Hegelian philosophy, but cannot be rendered well in English. It means (1) to destroy—*abrogare, tollere;* (2) to keep—*preservare;* (3) to elevate or raise to a higher position—*elevare.* Thus the child is *aufgehoben* in the man, *i. e.*, it ceases to be a child, it is preserved as a human being, and it is raised to a higher position, from childhood to manhood. The seed is *destroyed* in the plant as to form, *preserved* as to substance by being *elevated* to a more perfect form of existence.—P. S.]

1 Pet. i. 10, to whom also the βλέπειν was granted, 1 John i. 1.

Ver. 18. **Hear ye therefore.**—Not merely *understand* (de Wette), but *hear*, with the spiritual perception accorded to you.

Ver. 19. **When any one.**—The difficulty in the structure of this sentence arises from the putting forward of these words for the sake of emphasis. The word συνιέναι is scarcely rendered by the German *verstehen* (as Meyer thinks), and the English *understand*. It implies active and personal apprehension, or entering into the matter. The genitive indicates that the "*catching away*" takes place almost during the act of hearing.

Ver. 19. **This is he which received seed by the way-side,** or, rather, this is he who **is sown** by the way-side.—Meyer: "A change in the figure quite common among Orientals. It should have been: This is he in whose case the seed was sown by the way-side." But there is a deeper meaning in this change. The loss of the seed becomes in reality the loss of one's own life, just as the seed sown on good soil, so to speak, becomes identified with our personality. The change in the figure obviates the possible mistake, as if Satan could catch away and keep the word of God itself.

Ver. 21. **Yet hath he not root in himself.**—In his own individuality. His faith and adherence had their root only in the general excitement and enthusiasm around him. Accordingly, he dureth only for a while, is changeable, πρόσκαιρος, *temporarius.** He wants the perseverance of personal conviction. It deserves notice that the grand defect of such a person is characterized as εὐθὺς μετὰ χαρᾶς λαμβάνων αὐτόν. He immediately receives the word, as gladsome secular news are received, without experiencing its spiritual poignancy, in the moral conflicts and the deep sense of repentance which it engenders.—**By and by he is offended,** or rather, **immediately he taketh offence and falleth,** σκανδαλίζεται.—Not, he is offended, but persecution becomes to him a σκάνδαλον, as if there were something wrong with the word; and he stumbles and falls at this rock of offence; Luke viii. 13, ἀφίστανται.

Ver. 22. **He that heareth the word;** or rather, **is a hearer to the word.**—Pre-eminently a *hearer*. The expression is emphatic: οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τὸν λόγον ἀκούων, and means more than the simple hearing, already noticed.†—**The care of the** [not: of *this*] **world,** ἡ μέριμνα τοῦ αἰῶνος.—Not "of the pre-Messianic time." The absence of οὗτος deserves notice. Worldliness in persons of a serious cast of mind has a twofold aspect—that of worldly cares, and that of the entanglements of property, or of the deceitfulness of riches (personified), 2 Thess. ii. 10; Heb. iii. 13.—The expression, "**deceitfulness of riches,**" does not primarily apply to luxuriousness (delectatio), which would rather fall within the range of the other two classes of gospel-hearers. It refers to the deceitfulness of a false confidence in this worldly ground of subsistence, on the part of persons otherwise serious.—**And he becometh unfruitful;** ἄκαρπος γίνεται.—He does not yield fruit; there is every appearance of fruit—the stalk, the leaves, and the ear; but there is no spiritual life, no full surrender to the word, and accordingly no fruit.

Ver. 23. **He that heareth the word, and understandeth it,** in the fullest import of both terms.—The circumstance, that in neither of the other three cases such *understanding* of the word had taken place, implies that the *hearing* had likewise been defective. In the first case, there was dulness and carnality; in the second, fancifulness and a combination of worldliness with the truth; in the third, legalism, a servile spirit, and the absence of entire self-surrender. But he that heareth *aright* also understandeth the word, and accordingly is he "which also (ὃς δή) beareth fruit."—The different measures of fruitfulness depend on differences of disposition, of gifts, and of capacity for receiving, promoting, and representing the kingdom of God.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. "The general truth lying at the basis of this parable is, that the culture of the earth reflects that of heaven. The great outstanding features of humanity—the husbandry of God, are reflected in those of earth—the husbandry of man."

2. In accordance with this view a wider bearing might be given to this parable by referring it to the sowing of God's word generally in the world. But evidently the passage applies in a special manner to the foundation of the kingdom of heaven under the New Testament. The sower is Christ, and the seed the gospel. His scattering the seed in such abundance is explained on the ground, (1) of the freeness and fulness of His grace in sowing (ἐν τῷ σπείρειν αὐτόν); (2) of the poor condition of so much of the soil. If it is objected that this would savor of fatalism, we reply,—(1) That the passage under consideration is a parable, and hence does not in every respect adequately express the idea which it is intended to convey; (2) that the difference in the various kinds of spiritual soil is mainly the result of our own doing; (3) that this difficulty is removed by the change which the Lord introduces in the explanation of the picture. Those who received the seed were themselves sowed. The four classes of hearers form at the same time a gradation and a contrast: (1) By the way-*side:* souls trodden down and beaten down into hard, impenetrable soil by the lowest and meanest kind of worldliness and corruption. In their case the word is caught away even during the hearing of it. (2) Rocky ground, covered by a thin layer of earth: souls all the more enthusiastic in their early ardor, the less solid and settled they are in their personal convictions,—mere weathercocks, turning with every change of wind; the word apparently springing up with marvellous rapidity, but, not having root, withering away in the hour of trial. (3) Soil which might have yielded rich fruit, had it not been covered with thorns: earnest but legal minds, promising but superficial hearers, whose divided heart or worldliness causes them to lose the reward; the word springing up—the stalk and blossom appearing, but the fruit wanting. (4) Lastly, abundant fruit, showing that the soil from which it sprung is not only deep, but that weeds and thorns had been removed: souls whom the hearing of the word leads to its practical understanding, and to growing self-surrender unto the Lord.

The seed of the kingdom of heaven being thus scattered broadcast, it follows, from the character of the soil, that the kingdom of heaven—as outwardly visi-

* [ALFORD: "πρόσκαιρός ἐστιν, not only 'endureth for a while,' but also 'is the creature of circumstances,' changing as they change. Both ideas are included."—P. S.]

† [But the same expression occurs in ver. 20 and ver. 23, of two other classes of hearers.—P. S.]

16

ble—cannot present the picture of a pure and unmixed community of saints.

3. To the Jews, and to mere nominal Christians, this parable conveys the solemn truth that only part of the soil which is sown bears fruit. Of course, anything like an arithmetical calculation of the "fourth part" is out of the question; still, it implies that the number of God's people is small.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The kingdom of heaven under the figure of the sower and the seed: 1. The sower; 2. the seed; 3. the manner of sowing; 4. the field; 5. the harvest. —The kingdom of heaven is a sowing in hope on the field of the world: 1. Dangers which encompass this hope—bad soil, the fowls of the air, a burning sun, thorns; 2. certitude of this hope. Final destiny of the soil, its husbandry, the seed, the sowing.—The various classes of gospel-hearers: 1. The four classes (all hearers); 2. the three classes (merely hearers): 3. the two classes (those who merely hear and those who receive); 4. the one class (they who truly hear being those who also *receive*).—The difference in the soil as accounting for the difference of result from the sowing: 1. The difference in the soil: *a.* Soil that is trodden down—the way-side (service of sin); *b.* light, stony ground (superficial enthusiasm, outward appearances); *c.* ground from which the thorns have not been removed (a divided heart, legalism and worldliness); *d.* good ground which has undergone a threefold preparation (been turned up, been broken down, and from which thorns and weeds have been removed). 2. The difference of result: *a.* Scarcely has the seed been scattered when it is carried away by the enemy; *b.* springing up too rapidly, it withers and passes away; *c.* the ears make their appearance, but, alas! are empty; *d.* the full ear bending under its precious load.—Difference between mere appearance and reality in the kingdom of heaven: on the one hand, seed-corn exposed by the way-side—too rapid growth of the stalk, and large but empty ears; on the other hand, the seed taking root and sprouting unseen, springing slowly, growing up, and the full ear ripening.—How the seed becomes identified with the soil on which it is sown; or, the history of the word in our hearts as marking our own history.—Glorious character of that harvest which the Lord Himself desires, and with which He is "satisfied."—There may be difference in the quantity of the return, and yet the whole field be good soil. —Spiritual fruit as it is matured ever forming new spiritual seed.—How the kingdom of heaven is being completed by a continual alternation of seed-time and harvest.—"He that hath ears to hear," etc.; or, the great importance of parables for the increase of our spiritual knowledge.—Let us ever seek to apprehend the meaning and language of the signs of which God makes use.—Why the Lord speaks by parables.—The kingdom of heaven the one great mystery which comprehends and sums up all other mysteries.—It is *given* us to understand the mysteries of the kingdom.—"Whosoever hath," etc. The gifts which the Lord grants may be infinitely increased and extended.—How even the external senses seem to lose their natural capacities where the soul is dead to spiritual considerations.—The process of hardening as gradually growing into the final judgment.—"Blessed are your eyes."—Dignity and responsibility of the Christian in the world.—How Jesus explains His parables. —Jesus explaining by His Holy Spirit all the parables both of creation and of life.

Starke:—*Quesnel:* The heart of man is God's own field.—Let us beware lest our heart become like the way-side—ever open and accessible to the world, and to the things of the world.—Those who harden themselves will wax worse and worse, 2 Tim. iii. 13. —How is it that so many who go to the house of God, and listen to His word, remain unmoved?—Beware of quenching the Spirit.—The great privileges of the New Testament Church.—*Cramer:* Rest assured that where God has His word preached, the devil will not be far away (where Christ builds a church, the devil rears a chapel).—Nothing more dangerous than want of stability: to-day professedly for Christ, to-morrow against Him!—Prepare for trials the moment you give yourself wholly to the Lord (the cross and the crown are always combined).—The word of God will never return void unto Him, Isa. lv. 11.—The word of God not a dead letter, but living seed.

Lisco:—The parables serve at the same time to reveal and to conceal spiritual truth.—In the case of genuine inquirers they reveal the truth to the eye of faith, while they conceal it from the carnal, the sensual, and the ungodly.—Explanation of the parable in the text: 1. Those whose minds and hearts are dead; 2. those who are light-minded and unstable; 3. they who love the world, or who are undecided; 4. they in whom none of these obstacles prevail.

Gerlach:—The parables are like the pillar of the cloud and of fire, where darkness was presented to the Egyptians, but light and brightness to the covenant-people, Ex. xiv. 20. They resemble the husk which preserves the kernel *from* the indolent, and *for* the earnest and the diligent.—Every gift of God requires personal appropriation.—Care has precisely the same effect on the heart as riches; clinging to the things of earth keeps the poor as well as the rich from coming to Christ.—To hear, to understand, and to bring forth fruit!

Heubner:—It is a matter of indifference *where* we preach; the word of God sanctifies the place.—Let us learn to discern a spiritual bearing and import in the things that are visible.—To be always, as it were, lying by the way-side will at last convert the heart into an open highway, trodden down by those who pass by.—Birds: a most apt figure of evil thoughts, which ever flutter around the soul of hardened sinners and catch away anything good.—Let every one who is engaged in scattering the seed remember that an unseen enemy lieth in wait to mar his work; accordingly, let us ever be on our watch, and warn our hearers of the danger.—God is able to soften even the hardest heart.—Stony ground: sentimental religion (or dead orthodoxy); religion affected and imitated for the time.—A straw-flame is soon burnt out.—Thorny ground: a divided heart. Luther: These are they who serve two masters. But bear in mind also that the good ground does not yield fruit of itself. Theirs are hearts in themselves *empty*, but whom a sense of poverty has softened and rendered susceptible.—They bring forth fruit with patience (or rather, with perseverance, Luke viii. 15). —Blessed is he who daily sees and hears Christ in His word.—The patient waiting of the fathers for Christ should stir us up to think what cause for gratitude we have who live in gospel times.—The gospel the power of God unto salvation to every waiting, longing soul.—How young ministers are prone to expect too much.—The power of divine grace amidst all the obstacles which the world raises.—The patience

which both ministers and hearers require.—The preaching of the word of God the grand test of the heart of man.—Opposite effects of the preaching of the word.—The right preparation of the heart.

---

2. *The Second, Third, and Fourth Parables, and Interpretation of the Second Parable.* CH. XIII. 24–43

24 Another parable put he forth unto them,[1] saying, The kingdom of heaven is likened
25 unto a man which [who] sowed[2] good seed in his field: But while men slept, his ene-
26 my came and sowed [over][3] tares[4] among the wheat, and went his way. But when
27 the blade was sprung up, and brought forth fruit, then appeared the tares also. So
the servants of the householder came and said unto him, Sir, didst not thou [thou not][5]
28 sow good seed in thy field? from whence then hath it tares?[6] He said unto them, An
enemy hath done this. The servants said unto him, Wilt thou then that we go and
29 gather them up? But he said, Nay; lest while ye gather up the tares, ye root up also
30 the wheat with them. Let both grow together until the harvest: and in the time of
harvest I will say to the reapers, Gather ye together first the tares, and bind them in
bundles to burn them: but gather the wheat into my barn.
31 Another parable put he forth unto them, saying, The kingdom of heaven is like to
32 a grain of mustard seed, which a man took, and sowed in his field: Which indeed is
the least of all seeds: but when it is grown, it is the greatest among herbs [greater
than the herbs],[7] and becometh a tree, so that the birds of the air come and lodge in
the branches thereof.
33 Another parable spake he unto them; The kingdom of heaven is like unto leaven,
which a woman took, and hid in three measures of meal, till the whole was leavened.
34 All these things spake Jesus unto the multitude in parables; and without a parable
35 spake he not [he spake nothing][8] unto them: That it might be fulfilled which was
spoken by the prophet,[9] saying, I will open my mouth in parables; I will utter things
which have been kept secret from the foundation of the world.
36 Then Jesus [he][10] sent the multitude away, and went into the house: and his dis-
37 ciples came unto him, saying, Declare unto us the parable of the tares of the field. He
answered and said unto them,[11]
38 He that soweth the good seed is the Son of man; The field is the world; the good
seed [these, οὗτοι] are the children of the kingdom; but the tares are the children of
39 the wicked one; The enemy that sowed them is the devil; the harvest is the end of
40 the world; and the reapers are the[12] angels. As therefore the tares are gathered and
41 burned in the fire; so shall it be in the end of this [the][13] world. The Son of man
shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that
42 offend, and them which [that] do iniquity; And shall cast them into a [the] furnace of
43 fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth. Then shall the righteous shine
forth[14] as the sun in the kingdom of their Father. Who hath ears to hear, let him
hear.

[1] Ver. 24.—[Παρέθηκεν, *He set* or *laid before them* another parable as a spiritual riddle, challenging the close attention and solution of the hearers; comp. Mark iv. 34, ἐπέλυεν πάντα, *he solved* all, viz., the parables, E. V.: *he expounded all things to his disciples.*—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 24.—B., M., X., al. σπείραντι. [So also Lachmann and Alford, following the Vatican Codex, etc. Tischendorf, in his edition of 1859, reads σπείροντι (*seminanti*, instead of *qui seminavit*). Perhaps he will in a new edition adopt the other reading, since the Cod. Sinaiticus, as published by him in 1868, reads σπιραντι, a provincial (Egyptian?) spelling for σπείραντι, as the same Cod. frequently has ι for ει, e. g., φοβισθε for φοβεῖσθε in Matt. x. 28, 31.—P. S.]

[3] Ver. 25.—Cod. B., [also Cod. Sinait.], Lachmann, Tischendorf: ἐπέσπειρεν for ἔσπειρε. [Vulg.: *super*seminavit; Rhemish Vers.: *over*sowed; Lange: *säete darauf; sowed over the first seed.*—P. S.]

[4] Ver. 25.—[Ζιζάνια (probably a Hebrew word), i. e., *darnel; lolium temulentum;* Germ.: *Lolch, Tollkorn;* French: *ivroie*, so called to indicate the vertigo which it causes when eaten in bread. *See* the Exeg. Notes. But *tares* is more popular, as the German *Unkraut* in Luther's version is better understood than *Lolch* or *Tollkorn*. Hence the propriety of a change in this case might be questioned. I would prefer the term *bastard wheat.*—P. S.]

[5] Ver. 27.—[CONANT: "The form in the Common Version: *didst not thou*, gives a false emphasis; for, in the Greek, the negative verb qualifies the verb, and not its subject."—P. S.]

[6] Ver. 27.—The ancient testimony is decidedly against the *article* in τὰ ζιζάνια. [Lange misplaces this note to ver 26, where the critical authorities have the article. The Engl. Vers. is right in both cases.—P. S.]

[7] Ver. 32.—[In Gr.: μεῖζον τῶν λαχάνων; Lange: *grösser als die* (*andern*) *Kräuter* (alle andern Gartengewächse) i. e., larger than any herb.—P. S.]

[8] Ver. 34.—B., C., M., [Cod. Sinait.], Lachmann, Tischendorf read οὐδέν [instead of οὐκ].

[9] Ver. 35.—The addition: *Isaiah*, is false in fact and on critical grounds. [Comp. the critical note in Tischendorf's large edition *in loc.*, vol. i., p. 59.—P. S.]

[10] Ver. 36.—Ὁ Ἰησοῦς is an explanatory addition not found in the oldest MSS.

[11] Ver. 37.—Lit.: *He answering said;* αὐτοῖς (*to them*) is omitted in the critical editions.

[12] Ver. 39.—[*Angels*, without the article which is omitted in the Greek: ἄγγελοί εἰσιν.—P. S.]

[13] Ver. 40.—Lachmann, Tischendorf, following B., C., D., al., read simply τοῦ αἰῶνος [omitting τούτου. Alford, however, retains it against the decided weight of authorities, including Cod. Sinait.—P. S.]

[14] Ver. 43.—[*Shine forth*, ἐκλάμψουσιν, which is more than λάμψουσι, *effulgebunt* (not simply: *fulgebunt*, as the Latin Vulg. translates), *hervorstrahlen*, and signifies the sudden bursting forth of the inherent glory of the righteous. Comp. Dan. xii. 3, and Meyer *in loc.*—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 24. **The kingdom of heaven is likened,** or **made like,** ὡμοιώθη.—A delineation of the trials to which the kingdom of heaven was exposed from its first introduction into the world, and unavoidable connection with it. Hence the sower, who is the chief figure in the parable, cannot prevent the enemy from sowing tares among the wheat. The same expression is also used, ch. xviii. 23. The representation of the kingdom of heaven by "a certain man" recurs again in ver. 45, and in xx. 1. It is an entire mistake to interpret the passage as implying that the kingdom of heaven was "at the time not yet founded."

Ver. 25. **While men slept**;—*i. e.*, at night, when evil-disposed persons would try to injure the property of their neighbors. Hence, the application of this clause to the negligence of Christian teachers, who were appointed to watch and guard the field (Chrysostom, Augustine), is incorrect.* Still less does it refer to the sleep of sin (Calovius). Nor is it, on the other hand, merely a rhetorical figure (Meyer). It alludes to the weakness of men, through which the enemy succeeds in mixing up errors with saving truth, without this being perceived. Or perhaps it may denote, that professors of religion too frequently seek exclusively their personal comfort, without seriously reflecting upon, or being zealous for, the truth of the doctrines propounded.

Ver. 25. **Tares** [lit.: **darnel**].—The weed growing among wheat, ζιζάνιον, *lolium temulentum*, *darnel*. The only species of grass which in Eastern countries springs up wild among oats or wheat (Virg.: "*infelix lolium*," *Georg.* i. 154). At the first it looks like wheat, but its fruit is black, not yellow, and its effects are intoxicating and otherwise detrimental. If allowed to grow till the harvest, it is extremely difficult to separate it from the wheat; and, accordingly, it happens not unfrequently that it becomes mixed up with the flour. The Talmudists regarded it as a degenerate wheat. *See* the Art. in the Encycls. [St. Jerome, who resided long in Palestine, speaks *in loc.* of the striking similitude between *triticum* and *zizania*, wheat, and bastard wheat. Dr. Hackett (*Illustrations of Scripture*, p. 130) collected some specimens of this deceitful weed, and found, on showing them to friends, that they invariably mistook them for some species of grain, such as wheat or barley. Hence the rabbinical name, *bastard* (*i. e.*, *bastard wheat*).—P. S.]

[The *sowing of tares among wheat* is a kind of injury frequently practised to this day in the East, from malice and revenge. Roberts (*Biblical Illustrations*, p. 541, as quoted by Trench) relates of India: "See that lurking villain watching for the time when his neighbor shall plough his field; he carefully marks the period when the work has been finished, and goes in the night following, and casts in what the natives call *pandinellu*, *i. e.*, pig-paddy; this, being of rapid growth, springs up before the good seed, and scatters itself before the other can be reaped, so that the poor owner of the field will be for years before he can get rid of the troublesome weed." Trench (*Notes on the Parables*, p. 83, 9th Lond. ed.) relates a similar trick of malice from Ireland, where he knew an outgoing tenant, who, in spite of his ejection, sowed wild oats in the fields of the proprietor, which ripened and seeded themselves before the crops, so that it became next to impossible to get rid of them. Dr. Alford, too, *in loc.*, 4th ed., mentions that a field belonging to him in Leicestershire, England, was maliciously sown with charlock, and that heavy damages were obtained by the tenant against the offender.—P. S.]

And went his way.—The devil or his emissaries sow the seed and go their way; those who afterward hold the errors which they have sown, entertaining them rather in consequence of their natural darkness and folly than of set hostile purpose. [Trench: "The mischief done, the enemy '*went his way*,' and thus the work did not evidently and at once appear to be his. How often in the Church the beginnings of evil have been scarcely discernible; how often has that which bore the worst fruit in the end, appeared at first like a higher form of good!"—P. S.]

Ver. 26. **Then appeared the tares also**;—*i. e.*, it became then possible to distinguish them. The most fascinating error is seen in its true character whenever its poisonous fruit appears.

Ver. 29. **Lest ye root up also the wheat.**—Gerlach: "Our Lord allows both to grow together, not because His servants might be apt to mistake the tares for the wheat,—which would scarcely be the case if they knew anything of the matter, and which, at all events, would not apply to the reapers (ver. 30),—but because, however different the plants in themselves, their roots are so closely intertwined in the earth." This remark is very important; but some other elements must also be taken into account, such as the excitement and haste of these servants—they are not angels, as the reapers spoken of in ver. 30; and, lastly, that the difference between wheat and tares is not so distinct as at the time of the harvest.—The same commentator refers this verse exclusively to excesses of ecclesiastical discipline, for the purpose of excluding all unbelievers and hypocrites, and constituting a perfectly pure Church. He

* [It should be observed that the Saviour says: "while *men* slept," not: "while *the* men (belonging to the owner of the field), or the *servants* slept;" and that, in the exposition of the parable, He brings no charge of negligence against them, although there is, alas! always more or less of it in all ages and branches of the church. Trench: "The phrase is equivalent to 'at night,' and must not be further urged (Job xxxiii. 15; Mark iv. 27). This enemy seized his opportunity, when all eyes were closed in sleep, and wrought the secret mischief upon which he was intent, and having wrought it undetected, withdrew." So also Alford.—P. S.]

denies all allusion to the punishment of death for heresy, since the Lord spoke of the *Church*, and not of the secular power. But the Church here alluded to is the Church *in the world*, and tainted more or less with secularism.

Ver. 30. **In the time of the harvest,** ἐν καιρῷ, etc.—At the right and proper time, and hence in the time of the harvest.

Ver. 31. **A grain of mustard-seed.**—The mustard-plant, τὸ σίναπι (*sinapis orientalis*, in Chaldee חַרְדַּל),—a shrub bearing pods, which grows wild,* but in Eastern countries and in the south of Europe is cultivated for its seed. Three kinds of mustard were known, the black and the white being most in repute. The Jews grew mustard in their gardens. Its round seed-corns (4–6 in a pod) were proverbially characterized by them as the smallest thing (Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* 822); "which, indeed, holds true so far as the various kinds of seed-corn used in Jewish husbandry are concerned, though scientific botany knows still smaller seeds" (Winer). In hot climes the mustard-plant sometimes springs up to the dimensions of a small tree. Meyer and Royle refer the expression to the mustard-*tree* called Salvadora Persica. (Comp. Winer, and Ewald, *Jahrbücher* for 1849, p. 32.) But this view is manifestly inapt, as it would destroy not only the popular character, but also the point of the parable. We cannot believe that the Lord would introduce a tree growing in Persia into a picture drawn from common life in Judea.† Besides, nobody would deem it strange that a tree should grow up to its proper dimensions; but that the small shrub which had sprung from the least of all seeds should spread into a tree, and that the birds of the air should seek a lodgment in its branches, might well form ground of surprise, and serve as the basis of this parable. Heubner: Think of the mustard-seed of Eastern countries, not that of Europe, which grows to the height of from nine to fifteen yards.

Which a man [*handling it*] **took;** λαβών.—Meyer: "Circumstantiality and pictorialness of detail." In our opinion, it alludes to the fact, that a man was obliged cautiously and carefully to take up the seed, lest he should lose hold of it. So small as scarcely to admit of being handled.

Ver. 32. **Lodge in the branches thereof.**—Not merely, nestle or seek shelter, but lodge and remain, κατασκηνοῦν.

Ver. 33. **Unto leaven;** ζύμη.—Referring to the unperceived power and efficacy of the gospel, pervading, transforming, and renewing the mind, heart, and life. Starke: "The term *leaven* is used in other passages (xvi. 11; 1 Cor. v. 6, 7) in the sense of *evil*. Accordingly, some commentators understand it as also referring in this parable to the corruptions which have crept into the Church, and ultimately perverted it; and the woman as alluding to the Papacy and the Romish clergy (Rev. ii. 20; xvii. 1), who, with their leaven of false doctrine, have leavened the three estates of Christendom (the three measures of meal). However, the gospel may also, in many respects, be likened unto leaven; as, for example, with reference to its pervading influence (Heb. iv. 12), to its rapid spread (Luke xii. 49), to its rendering the bread palatable and wholesome, etc. According to Macarius, the parable before us alludes to both these elements" (the leaven of original sin, and its counter-agent, the leaven of grace and salvation).—Rieger (*Betracht. über d. N. T.* i.) better: "In other passages of Scripture the term *leaven* is used as a figure of insidious and fatal corruption, finding its way into the Church. But manifestly this cannot be the case in the present instance. The passage does not bear: The kingdom of heaven is like unto three measures of meal, with which leaven became mixed up; but, The kingdom of heaven is like unto leaven—showing that the leaven, which in itself is not noxious and evil, but, on the contrary, highly useful and wholesome, serves here as a figure of the secret but all-pervading and subduing power of the gospel. In point of fact, the same idea recurs in Heb. iv. 2, where we read of the word *being mixed* with faith in them that hear it." To these remarks we add: 1. It were contrary to the rules of hermeneutics to treat an *allegorical figure* like a *dogmatic statement*. Thus in different passages the lion is used as a figure of Satan, but also of Christ; the serpent as a figure of the enemy, but also of the wisdom needful to the Apostles; birds as a figure of believing trustfulness, but also of the devil catching away the word. 2. All the parables in this section bear upon the development of the kingdom of heaven. Hence, if Starke's supposition were correct, the parable under consideration would be quite out of its place in this context. 3. It is impossible to conceive that the kingdom of heaven could be leavened by evil as by a power stronger than itself, and thus be hopelessly destroyed. 4. Leaven may indeed be employed as a figure of sin and evil in the sense of being stronger than individual Christians, when left in their own strength to combat with error, etc. (xvi. 6; 1 Cor. v. 6, 7), but not in that of being more powerful than the kingdom of heaven. 5. Leaven as such is nowhere in the Bible a figure of evil, but a neutral figure of an all-pervading, contagious power. Mark also Lev. xxiii. 17: "They shall be baken with *leaven;* they are the first-fruits unto the Lord."

Three measures.—Σάτον, סְאָה, a hollow measure used for dry substances; according to Josephus, equal to 1½ Roman measures. The expression, *three* measures, is not accidental, but intended to denote the large quantity which the leaven has to pervade. *Three* is the symbolical number for spiritual things. The Spirit of Christ pervades and transforms our spirits in an unseen and spiritual manner. "The Fathers interpreted the number three allegorically." Theod. of Mopsuest. referred it to the Jews, the Samaritans, and the Greeks.* This, however, is, strictly speaking, not an allegorical interpretation; comp. Acts i. 8. Olshausen approves of a reference of the number three to the sanctification of the three powers of human nature [body, soul, and spirit] by the gospel. Similarly it might be applied to the three grand forms in our Christian world—individuals (catechumens), Church and State, and the physical Cosmos. The main point, however, is to remember that the whole domain of mind, heart, and life, in all their bearings, is to be pervaded and transformed by the Spirit of God.

Ver. 34. **He spake nothing** (οὐδέν) **unto them;**—*i. e.*, to the people concerning the kingdom

* [And to a very considerable size, in the fertile soil of Palestine, as high as the horses' heads.—P. S.]

† [But the Salvadora Persica was also found by Irby and Mangles on or near the peninsula of the Dead Sea. *See* Royle in Journal of Sacred Lit., 1849, p. 271, and Robinson, Dict. sub σίναπι. But if the mustard-*tree* had been intended, it would hardly have been numbered among the *herbs*, λάχανα, ver. 32, which grow in the garden.—P. S.]

* [Augustin, and quite recently Stier, refer it to the three sons of Noah.—P. S.]

of heaven, especially at that particular period. Hence also the use of the imperfect. Meyer.

Ver. 35. **By the prophet.**—A free quotation of Ps. lxxviii. 2. Meyer reminds us that in 2 Chron. xxix. 30 Asaph is designated a "seer," or prophet.

Ver. 38. **The good seed are the children of the kingdom; but the tares are the children of the wicked one.**—Fritzsche: *fruges ex semine enatæ.* As in the explanation of the first parable, so here also the seed is identified with the souls in which it was sown. Our life becomes identified with the spiritual seed, and principles assume, so to speak, a bodily shape in individuals. Such a concrete mode of presenting this truth is all the more suitable in this place, since our Lord is further developing and applying this parable.—The children of the wicked (literally here the tares) are sown by the wicked—of course, in a moral sense, not according to the substance of their human nature, just as the sons of the kingdom are specifically "the seed" sown by the Saviour in the moral and religious sense. These men have become what they are by the principles which they have embraced. This appears from the expression in ver. 41: "They shall gather out of His kingdom πάντα τὰ σκάνδαλα καὶ τοὺς ποιοῦντας τὴν ἀνομίαν." The *scandala* are offences in respect of doctrine, heresies, and seductive principles; the *anomists* are those who represent or embrace these principles (among whom Christ also included the representatives of Jewish traditionalism).

Ver. 40. **At the end of the world,** or rather, of this **Æon.**—4 Esra vii. 43: *Dies judicii erit finis temporis hujus et initium temporis futuræ immortalitatis, in quo transivit corruptela.*

Ver. 41. **Out of His kingdom,**—clearly showing that the συντέλεια must be regarded as an interval of time, and hence indicating that there is a period intervening between the reappearing of Christ and the first resurrection connected with it, and the last resurrection, or that transformation of the present Æon, which marks the close of the final judgment; Rev. xx., compared with 1 Cor. xv. 23. Meyer: "The separation of which the Lord speaks, is that of *the* good and *the* evil (individuals), and only thereby a separation of good and evil (things)." But in the text the σκάνδαλα are mentioned before the ποιοῦντες, who are here identified with these σκάνδαλα. Similarly also the righteous are identified with that heavenly brightness which now shines forth in them.

Ver. 42. **A furnace of fire.**—Not Sheol, or Hades, but *Gehenna*, or *Hell*, Rev. xx. 15; Matt. xxv. 41; the place of punishment and Æon of those who are subject to the second death. [TRENCH: Fearful words indeed! and the image, if it be an image, borrowed from the most dreadful and painful form of death in use among men. David, alas! made the children of Ammon taste the dreadfulness of it. It was in use among the Chaldeans, Jer. xxix. 22; Dan. iii. 6. Antiochus resorted to it in the time of the Maccabees, 2 Macc. vii.; 1 Cor. xiii. 3. In modern times, Chardin makes mention of penal furnaces in Persia.—P. S.]

Ver. 43. **Then shall the righteous shine forth,** ἐκλάμψουσιν.—Then the brightness of their δόξα shall visibly break forth; Dan. xii. 3; Rom. viii.; and other passages.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. THE PARABLE OF THE TARES among the wheat.—The basis of this parable is the natural tendency of the ground to produce noxious weeds, thorns, and briers, or to degenerate. Hence the parable is intended to represent the obstacles with which the kingdom of heaven meets, and which it has to overcome. As in the natural earth tares and weeds rapidly spread, till they threaten to destroy the precious grain, so the seed of natural corruption in the heart and life threatens to choke that of the kingdom of heaven. The parable embodies three leading ideas. In opposition to the heavenly sower we see His adversary similarly employed; by the side of the good seed which Christ scatters we have that of the tares and the weeds of the devil; while the noxious plants, as they spring up, threaten to choke or to spoil the precious fruit. In other words, the kingdom of God is opposed by another kingdom—that of conscious malice, of which Satan, the adversary of Christ, is the head. His seed are the σκάνδαλα, or spiritually seductive principles, here represented by the tares, which look like the wheat, just as heresies resemble the truth. This seed he scatters at night; *i. e.*, the enterprise, dictated by the malice of the enemy, succeeds through the weakness and folly of man. Protected by the darkness of night, the noxious weed, scattered all through the wheat, springs up, and, resembling the good fruit, grows up luxuriantly, till it threatens to choke the wheat, or to spoil it by foreign and dangerous admixture. In passing, we have already hinted that the picture of men sleeping may refer to the contrast between the religious comforts and enjoyments indulged in by the Church, and the watchfulness of schools on behalf of purity of doctrine.

2. *Movement on the part of the servants.*—This constitutes the second great feature of the parable. Their proposals arose partly from indignation against the enemy, partly from an impatient zeal for outward appearance of purity—from pride in the field, and partly from apprehension for the good seed. They were desirous of removing the tares. The Lord prohibited it, lest they should also root up the wheat. These considerations have been matter of the utmost importance in the history of the Church of Christ. It is well known that Novatianism on the one hand, and the papal hierarchy on the other, have addressed themselves to this work of uprooting, despite the prohibition of the Lord, and that the Romish Church has at last ended by condemning to the flames only the best wheat. But from this passage we learn that, according to the ordinance of the Lord, the Old Testament punishment denounced upon false prophets and blasphemers does not apply to the New economy.* It is contrary to the mind and will of Christ to pronounce a ban, in the sense of denouncing final judgment upon men, by way of removing them and their errors from the Church. This toleration must not, however, be regarded as implying that evil and sin are to escape all punishment in the Church: it only implies that we are to remember and strictly to observe the distinction between the sowing and the reaping time. But within the limits here indi-

* [The mediæval divines who defended the capital punishment of heretics, found a loophole in the words: *lest ye root up also the wheat with them;* from which they inferred that the prohibition was binding only *conditionally.* But unfortunately for this inference, the Saviour continues: *Let both grow together until the harvest,* and makes no exceptions at all. On the other hand, however, this passage must not be abused and misunderstood so as to sanction the Erastian latitudinarianism and to undermine discipline which is elsewhere solemnly enjoined by Christ and the apostles, and is indispensable for the spiritual prosperity of the Church.—P. S.]

cated, it is our duty to correct all current mistakes, James v. 19; to refute every error and heresy, 1 Tim. iv. 1-6; and either to remove from the Church antichristian doctrine and practical offences, with all who are chargeable therewith, or else to induce such persons to leave the Church by refusing to own and acknowledge them, Matt. xviii. 15; 1 Cor. v.; 2 John ver. 10.

But all these arrangements are only intended by way of discipline during the course of the development of the New Testament economy—in hope, not as a punitive economy of judgment. It is scarcely necessary to add, that they bear no reference whatever to the civil administration of justice (Rom. xiii. 4).

[Dr. Lange might also have referred to the famous Donatist controversy in the African Church during the fourth and fifth centuries, whose chief exegetical battle-ground was this parable of the tares. The Catholics, represented by St. Augustine, claimed the whole parable, and especially the warning in vers. 29 and 30, against the disciplinarian rigorism and ecclesiastical purism of the Donatists; while the Donatists tried to escape the force of the parable by insisting that *the field* here spoken of is not the Church but the *world*, ver. 38. The parable, they said, has no bearing on our controversy, which is not whether ungodly men should be endured *in the world* (which we all allow), but whether they should be tolerated *in the Church* (which we deny). The Catholics replied that the mixture of good and bad men in the *world* is beyond dispute and known to all; that the Saviour speaks here of *the kingdom of heaven*, or the Church which is catholic and intended to spread over the whole world. Trench speaks at length on this important disciplinarian controversy in his *Notes*, p. 84 sqq., and defends throughout the Augustinian view (as does Wordsworth); but there was an element of truth in the puritanic zeal of the Donatists and kindred sects in their protest against a latitudinarian, secularized state-churchism. Comp. the forthcoming second volume of my *History of Ancient Christianity*, ch. vi. §§ 69-71.—P. S.]

3. *Until the harvest.*—A final and complete separation shall certainly be made. But it requires the heavenly clearness, purity, calmness, and decidedness of angels properly to accomplish this process.—"Then shall the righteous shine forth." This shining forth is brought about by the deliverance of the Church from the burden of its former connection with evil, by its complete redemption (Luke xxi. 28), and by the change and entire transformation now taking place in everything around,—thus combining at the same time inward blessedness with outward, glorious manifestation of spiritual life, in all its fulness and perfectness.

4. *The enemy that sowed them is the devil.*—This passage has rightly been adduced as one of the strongest proofs that Christ propounded the doctrine concerning the devil as of His own revelation, and not from accommodation to popular prejudices. For, (1) Our Lord speaks of the devil not in the parable, but in His explanation of its figurative meaning, which, of course, must be taken in its literal and proper sense; (2) He speaks of him not in presence of the people, but within the circle of His intimate disciples; (3) He refers to the devil as the personal founder and centre of the kingdom of darkness, and as opposed to the person of the Son of Man, the centre and founder of the kingdom of light. Other passages show that, on many occasions, Jesus of His own accord bore witness to this doctrine (comp. Matt. iv.; John viii. 44, etc.).

[Trench, *Notes*, p. 89: "We behold Satan here, not as he works beyond the limits of the Church, deceiving the world, but in his far deeper skill and malignity, as he at once mimics and counterworks the work of Christ: in the words of Chrysostom: 'after the prophets, the false prophets; after the Apostles, the false apostles; after Christ, Antichrist.' Most worthy of notice is the plainness with which the doctrine concerning Satan and his agency, his active hostility to the blessedness of man, of which there is so little in the Old Testament, comes out in the New; as in the last parable, and again in this. As the lights become brighter, the shadows become deeper; not till the mighty power of good had been revealed, were we suffered to know how mighty was the power of evil; and even here it is in each case only to the innermost circles of disciples that the explanation concerning Satan is given." Bengel (*Gnom.* on Eph. vi. 12) makes a similar remark: "*Quo apertius quisque Scripturæ liber de œconomia et gloria Christi agit, eo apertius rursum de regno contrario tenebrarum.*"—P. S.]

5. The *furnace of fire*, into which the wicked are to be cast at the manifestation of the new Æon, is probably intended as a counterpart to the fiery furnace to which, during the best period of the old Æon, the faithful had so often been consigned (Dan iii.). If from the one furnace a hymn of praise and thanksgiving rose to heaven, from the other resounds the wailing of anguish and pain, and the gnashing of teeth in rage and malice; comp. Rev. ix. 2. The fiery torments which the righteous underwent afforded a view of heaven as in and among men; those which the wicked endure bring out the inward hell existing in the bosom of humanity. Similarly the "outer darkness," where there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth (viii. 12, etc.), forms an antithesis to the sacred darkness in which Jehovah dwelleth, Ex. xx. 21, amidst the praises of Israel, Ps. xxii. 4; and to the darkness of trials and sorrows which the Lord lightens up, Isa lviii. 10. All these contrasts point to the fact, that it is the wicked who make hell what it is. The *auto da fé's* of the Middle Ages were only a horrible caricature and anticipation of that fiery judgment.

6. *Then the righteous shall shine forth as the sun.* With the separation at the judgment, the Christian life, subjectively and objectively considered, appears in its full heavenly glory. [Trench: "As *fire* was the element of the dark and cruel kingdom of hell, so is *light* of the pure heavenly kingdom. *Then*, when the dark, hindering element has been removed, shall this element of light, which was before struggling with and obstructed by it, come forth in its full brightness. Col. iii. 3; Rom. viii. 18; Prov. xxv. 4, 5. A glory shall be revealed *in* the saints: not merely brought *to* them and added from without; but rather a glory which they before had, but which did not before evidently appear, shall burst forth and show itself openly, as once in the days of His flesh, at the moment of transfiguration, did the hidden glory of our Lord. That shall be the day of 'the manifestation of the sons of God.'"—P. S.]

7. The Grain of Mustard-seed.—The first two parables were intended (just as Mark iv. 26-29) to delineate the succession of events in the development of the kingdom of heaven; that of the grain of mustard-seed bears reference principally to its extension in space, not in time, while at the same time it do

picts the conquering power of the gospel. At first it seems as if the hostile principle had now wholly disappeared. The grain of mustard-seed—so small and despised in the outward appearance of Him who bore the form of a servant, or rather, in that of His disciples—shoots up, and the smallest of seeds grows into a high bush, so as even to resemble a tree. But in consequence of this very growth, the birds of the air mistake the bush for a tree, and seek to make a lodgment in its branches. This was verified in the ecclesiastical establishment which Constantine founded, in the mediæval Church, and indeed applies to the visible Church generally. Not only sweet songsters, but even birds of prey, seek to build their nests on this heavenly tree.

[ALFORD: "This parable, like most others respecting the kingdom of God, has a *double reference*—*general* and *individual*. (1) In the *general* sense, the insignificant beginnings of the kingdom are set forth: the little babe cast in the manger at Bethlehem; the Man of sorrows with no place to lay His head; the crucified One; or again the hundred and twenty names who were the seed of the Church after the Lord had ascended; then we have the Kingdom of God waxing onward and spreading its branches here and there, and different nations coming into it. 'He must increase,' said the great Forerunner. We must beware, however, of imagining that the *outward Church-form* is this kingdom. It has rather *reversed* the parable, and is the worldly power waxed to a great tree, and the Churches taking refuge under the shadow of it. It may be, where not corrupted by error and superstition, subservient to the growth of the heavenly plant: but is not itself that plant. It is at best no more than (to change the figure) the scaffolding to aid the building, not the building itself. (2) The *individual* application of the parable points to the small beginnings of divine grace; a word, a thought, a passing sentence, may prove to be the little seed which eventually fills and shadows the whole heart and being, and calls 'all thoughts, all passions, all delights,' to come and shelter under it."—P. S.]

8. THE LEAVEN.—Heubner: "If the former parable presents the *extensive* power of Christianity, this exhibits its *intensive*, *dynamic* force." *See* also the list furnished by that author (p. 199) of works on the effects of Christianity, and the works of writers on Apologetics, Missions, etc. The woman is an apt figure of the Church.* Leaven, a substance *kindred* and yet quite opposed to meal,—having the power of transforming and preserving it, and of converting it into bread, thus representing the divine in its relation to, and influence upon, our natural life. One of the main points in the parable is the "*hiding*," or the mixing of the leaven in the three measures of meal. This refers to the great visible Church,† in which the living gospel seems, as it were, hidden and lost. It appears as if the gospel were engulfed in the world; but under the regenerating power of Christianity it will at last be seen that the whole world shall be included in the Church. Here, then, the transformation of human nature, of society, of institutions, of customs, in short, of the whole Cosmos—or the gradual "regeneration" (Matt. xix. 28)—forms the principal point in view.* But this Christianization of the whole world is not incompatible with the development of Antichrist in the world, nor with the unbelief and the hardening of individual sinners. Nay, this very *dedication* of life *as a whole*, in consequence of which the Church will at last possess and claim everything, only becomes a judgment, unless it be made ours by personal regeneration, just as unbelief transforms the most glorious truths into the most awful and the most dangerous errors, 2 Thess. ii.

[ALFORD: "The two parables are intimately related. *That* was of the *inherent, self-developing power* of the kingdom of heaven as a seed containing in itself the principle of expansion; *this*, of the *power which it possesses of penetrating and assimilating a foreign mass*, till all be taken up into it. And the comparison is not only to the *power* but to the *effect* of leaven also, which has its *good* as well as its bad side, and for that good is used: viz., to make wholesome and fit for use that which would otherwise be heavy and insalubrious. Another striking point of comparison is in the fact that leaven, as used ordinarily, is a *piece of the leavened loaf* put amongst the new dough—(τὸ ζυμωθὲν ἅπαξ ζύμη γίνεται τῷ λοιπῷ πάλιν. Chrys. Hom. xlvi. p. 484 A)—just as the kingdom of heaven is the renewal of humanity by the righteous Man Christ Jesus.—The parable, like the last, has its *general* and its *individual* application: (1) In the penetrating of the *whole mass of humanity*, by degrees, by the influence of the Spirit of God, so strikingly witnessed in the earlier ages by the dropping of heathen customs and worship;—in modern times more gradually and secretly advancing, but still to be plainly seen in the various abandonments of criminal and unholy practices (as e. g. in our own time of slavery and duelling, and the increasing abhorrence of war among Christian men), and without doubt in the end to be signally and universally manifested. But this effect again is not to be traced in the establishment or history of so-called Churches, but in the hidden advancement, without observation, of that deep leavening power which works irrespective of human forms and systems. (2) In the transforming power of the 'new leaven' on the *whole being of individuals*. 'In fact the Parable does nothing less than set forth to us the mystery of regeneration, both in its first act, which can be but once, as the leaven is but once hidden; and also in the consequent (subsequent?) renewal by the Holy Spirit, which, as the ulterior working of the leaven, is continual and progressive.' (Trench, p. 97.) Some have contended for this as the sole application of the parable; but not, I think, rightly.—As to whether the γυνή has any especial meaning (though I am more

* [So already ST. AMBROSE (*Expos. in Luc. vii*). TRENCH (*Notes*, p. 115) remarks: "In and through the Church the Spirit's work proceeds: only as the Spirit dwells in the Church (Rev. xxii. 7) is that able to mingle a nobler element in the mass of humanity, in the world." .. "The woman *took* the leaven from elsewhere to mingle it with the lump: and even such is the gospel, a kingdom not of this world, not the unfolding of any powers which already existed therein, a kingdom not rising, as the secular kingdoms, 'out of the earth' (Dan. vii. 17), but a new power brought into the world from above; not a philosophy, but a Revelation."—P. S.]

† [Lange calls it *Weltkirche*, by which he does not mean either the church secularized nor the various established or state-churches, but the large body of nominal Christendom.—P. S.]

* [Dr. TRENCH (p. 16) aptly illustrates this feature of the parable from the early history of Christianity, whose working below the surface of society was long hidden from the view of the heathen writers. and yet went on with irresistible force until the whole Roman world was leavened by it. And yet the external conversion of the empire was only a part of the work. Besides this, there was the eradication of innumerable heathen opinions, practices, and customs which had entwined their fibres round the very heart of society. This work was never thoroughly accomplished till the whole structure of Roman society went to pieces, and the new Teutonic civilization was erected on its ruins.—P. S.]

and more convinced that such considerations are not always to be passed by as nugatory), it will hardly be of much consequence here to inquire, seeing that γυναῖκες σιτοποιοί would be everywhere a matter of course."—P. S.]

9. *That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet* (not as a verbal, but as a typical prophecy).—Asaph was a seer, and the Psalm here quoted was prophetic, tracing in a series of historical pictures the disobedience and the hardening of Israel, the divine judgments, and the subsequent compassion and mercy of God. This prophecy was fulfilled in the parables of Christ, so far as concerned both their form and their matter. In reference to their form, Christ unfolded in them all the mysteries of the kingdom of God; in reference to their matter, the first parables bear chiefly on the hardening of the people, while the subsequent parables exhibit His infinite and glorious compassion.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

A. The Parable of the Tares, Matt. xiii. 24–30, and interpretation of the same in vers. 36–43.—The tares among the wheat in the field of Christ: 1. What is their character? (outwardly they resemble the wheat, but in reality they are quite different and opposed.) 2. How did they come among the wheat? (through the malice of the devil and the weakness of man.) 3. What are the dangers accruing from their presence? (they injure the wheat by robbing it of its beauty and strength; and, indirectly, through the imprudent zeal of the servants, they even endanger its existence.) 4. Still they are made to subserve a good purpose (teaching us to watch, to discern, to live, and to spare life, and to wait in humility and patience). 5. They assuredly shall be separated in the day of harvest (judged by their own fruit, by the sentence of Christ, by the angels of heaven, by fire).—*And he went his way* (cowardice, malice, calculation).—How the seed of the evil one frequently assumes the *appearance* of human nature, and even of the divine life.—Mark! it is not the wheat among the tares, but the tares among the wheat (in answer to the charges of ancient and modern Novatianism against the Church).—An enemy hath done this.—*Impatience of the servants* in the kingdom of God: 1. Its higher and nobler motives; 2. marks of its carnal and sinful origin.—Spurious zeal (fanaticism) the worst enemy we have to meet in the Church.—Satan accomplishes more by calling forth false zeal in the disciples than even by sowing tares.—Has the Church of Christ always obeyed this injunction of the Master?—Let both grow together: 1. Absolutely and unconditionally; yet, 2. within how narrow limits!—How the tares and the wheat mutually protect each other till the time of harvest.—How the godly and the ungodly serve and assist each other in the kingdom of God.—Freedom of religion must be connected with religion of freedom.—A proper religious toleration, at the same time a proper discipline, in the spirit of the gospel.—Let us seek to distinguish the visible and the invisible Church, but not to separate them upon earth.—The whole world is the field of Christ.—As the seed in our hearts, so are we.—Final judgment upon the offences in the kingdom of God, and the glorious manifestation of the Church of Christ.

Starke:—*Osiander:* God spares the wicked for the sake of the godly who live among them.—*Chrysostomus: Fortem diabolum facit nostra negligentia, non illius potentia.*—When the watchmen sleep, the devil is awake, Acts xx. 29, 30; *Nova Bibl. Tub.*—*Quesnel:* Let faithful ministers be careful to point out the tares.—*Cramer:* The devil is the cause of all the evil in the world, John viii. 44.—It is not every kind of zeal for the glory of God which deserves commendation.—*Zeisius:* The good seed must not be neglected on account of the tares: one sincere and earnest Christian is worth far more in the sight of God than a thousand hypocrites and sinners.—It is impossible to transform the tares into wheat; but the grace of God may, through the earnest zeal of the disciples, convert the ungodly into humble followers of Jesus.—The ungodly despise Christians, but they are indebted to them for preservation and immunity from judgments, Gen. xviii. 26.—*Canstein:* If we would understand the mysteries of the kingdom of God, let us in retirement seek enlightenment from the Lord.—The Church is the husbandry of God.

Heubner:—*The enemy goeth his way.*—How the evil one succeeds in craftily concealing his presence!—Along with the spread and extension of good, evil also increaseth.—*The will of the Master is, Nay!*—The long-suffering and patience of God puts them to shame, and worketh patience in them.—Here Christ bears witness to that divine toleration which He manifests in the government of His Church.—Reasons of this prohibition: 1. The servants might commit a mistake (confound the wheat with the tares)—some may have the root of the thing in them; 2. they might root up the wheat along with the tares (since good and evil are often very closely intertwined); 3. the godly are to be tried; 4. the wicked may yet be saved.—They are bound in bundles: indicating their fellowship in misery.—The real and internal dignity of God's people does not yet appear.

Dräseke:—The enemy comes when people are asleep.—What a strange mixture in the kingdom of heaven!—*Bachmann:* The mixture of the godly and of sinners in the Church of Christ.—*Reinhard:* On the view which Christ Himself entertained of His kingdom upon earth.

B. The Parable of the Grain of Mustard-seed—The kingdom of heaven under the figure of a grain of mustard-seed: 1. The least of all seeds (poverty and humility of Christ; His Apostles, publicans and fishermen; His message, reconciliation through a crucified and risen Saviour). 2. The greatest among herbs (the Church universal and a universal religion): *a.* The richest and best among herbs (the planting of the Lord); *b.* appearing to be a tree (so strong as to be able to bear even that worldly spirits should lodge in its branches).—Christianity, as reflecting both the humility and the majesty of its Founder (at first so small in its outward appearance, that men could scarcely seize it; then so large, as to comprehend all: thus, both in history and in the life of the individual Christian).—The contrast between the infinite smallness of the seed and the greatness of the herb, an evidence of the intensity of the principle of growth in the plant.—Christianity twice misunderstood and twice glorified: at first in its smallness, and then in its vast extent.—The commencement of all the works of God small in the eyes of the world: commencement of creation (the light), of humanity (the first pair), of the covenant-people (Isaac, the younger of the two brothers), of the Church (the confession of fishermen), of the new life (faith).—Contrast between the commencement of Christianity and that of the kingdoms of this world.

Starke:—Marginal note of Luther: There is not anywhere a word more despised than the gospel; yet there is none more powerful, since it justifies those who believe in it, which neither the law nor works could do.—This passage may be applied either to the gospel or to the Church. — *Canstein*: This is the work and wisdom of God, that He makes something of things which are not, and mighty things of those which are weak, while He humbleth and abaseth the things which are high and great, 1 Cor. i. 26, 27.—*Zeisius*: The weakest faith will grow and extend, and comprehend more than heaven and earth, even Christ Himself, with all that He is, and all that He hath, Eph. iii. 17; 1 Pet. v. 10.—*Majus*: No human power is able to obstruct or prevent the extension of the Church.

Lisco:—Small the beginning, gradual the progress, but great and glorious the issue.—Nations shall flock into the Church of Christ, where they will find safety, salvation, peace, and true happiness.—*Heubner*: The great things of God have always had a small beginning (to outward appearance).—When commencing, in humble confidence on the Lord, what seemeth a small work, always remember that it may grow into a mighty blessing to those who are near, and to those who are afar off. This, indeed, is the proper way of triumphing: a small beginning and a mighty ending. The opposite is a lamentable failure.

C. The Parable of the Leaven.—Christianity the hidden power of regeneration both in the world and in the life of believers.—The Church under the figure of the woman hiding the leaven among the meal: 1. The woman; 2. the leaven; 3. the three measures of meal; 4. the hiding of the leaven among them; 5. the result.—The life from God in its progressive victory over the natural life of the world.—The more fully the leaven is hid, and the more completely it seems to have disappeared, the more rapidly and powerfully does it penetrate and leaven the whole mass.—The work of regeneration: 1. On what it depends (leaven stronger than meal); 2. its process (hidden, gradual, all-subduing); 3. the result (all the measures of meal leavened, the divine life penetrating everywhere and everything).—The regeneration of humanity does not necessarily imply that of every individual.—The higher society as a whole is elevated by Christianity, the lower may the individual sink.—The transformation of the heart must correspond to that of the world.

Starke:—The eye of the Lord is not only upon important affairs of state, but also upon our common and humble employments. — *Hedinger*: Not only vices, but also good examples are infectious.—If the word of God is to appear in all its power and efficacy, it must be mixed with faith in the heart.

Lisco:—Man remains man, but he becomes partaker of the divine nature, 2 Pet. i. 3, 4; and hence an entirely changed being.—This power works invisibly, gradually, effectively, and irresistibly, till the whole nature of man, from its principle to its individual faculties, is penetrated, transformed, subdued, and assimilated, and until every foreign and ungodly element is expelled.—Indissoluble communion between what is leavened and the leaven: between believers and Christ.

Heubner: The all-penetrating power of the gospel and of its economy, especially of the blood of reconciliation in the death of Jesus.—Even avowed enemies of Christianity have been obliged partly to own the power of the gospel.—Where the leaven of Christianity is wanting, the whole mass will become corrupt.—Each Christian should operate as leaven upon all around.

D. Fulfilment of the prophecy (vers. 34, 35).—Christ the revelation.—Christ the revealer of all secrets: 1. Of those of God; 2. of humanity; 3. of the history of the kingdom of God; 4. of the kingdom of heaven.—The parables of Christ revealed secrets of God.—Even the parabolic form used by Christ, partly for concealing the truth, became a new revelation.

Starke:—*Osiander*: Whenever we see natural things, let us elevate our minds to heavenly realities. —*Quesnel*: The mysteries which from all eternity had been hid in God, and which from the beginning of the world had been presented in types and prophecies, were at last revealed by Christ, and are more and more fulfilled in and by Him, Rom. xvi. 25.

---

8. *The Fifth, Sixth, and Seventh Parables, and Parabolical Close of this Section.* Ch. XIII. 44–52.

44 Again,[1] the kingdom of heaven is like unto [a] treasure hid in a [the, τῷ] field; the
which when a man hath found, he hideth [which a man found, and concealed;], and for
joy thereof [he] goeth and selleth all that he hath, and buyeth that field.
45 Again, the kingdom of heaven is like unto a merchantman [merchant],[2] seeking
46 goodly pearls: Who [And],[3] when he had found one pearl of great price, [he] went
and sold all that he had, and bought it.
47 Again, the kingdom of heaven is like unto a net [draw-net], that was cast into the
48 sea, and gathered [gathering together, συναγαγούσῃ] of every kind: Which, when it
was full, they drew to [the] shore, and sat down, and gathered the good into vessels,
49 but cast the bad away. So shall it be at the end of the world: the angels shall come
50 [go] forth, and sever [separate] the wicked from among the just, And shall cast them
into the furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth.
51 Jesus saith unto them,[4] Have ye understood all these things? They say unto him,
52 Yea, Lord.[5] Then said he unto them, Therefore every scribe *which is*[6] instructed unto
[in] the kingdom of heaven,[7] is like unto a man *that is* a householder [to a householder]
which [who] bringeth forth out of his treasure *things* new and old.

[1] Ver. 44.—[*Again*, πάλιν, is wanting in the best MSS., as B., D., also in Cod. Sinait., in the Latin Vulgate, and is thrown out by Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, and Conant. Lachmann retains it, but in brackets. It may easily have been inserted from vers. 45 and 47; but it may also have been omitted here at the beginning of a new series of parables. Lange retains it in his translation and ingeniously defends it in the Exeg. Notes.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 45.—[Merchant-*man* is now only used of a trading vessel, as distinguished from a ship-of-war. *See* the English Dict.—P. S.]

[3] Ver. 46.—[According to the true reading of Codd. Sinait., Vatic., Cantabr., etc., and the critical editions: εὑρὼν δέ, instead of ὃς εὑρών. *See* Meyer, p. 278.—P. S.]

[4] Ver. 51.—Codd. B., D., Ital., Vulg., etc., omit: λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς. So Lachmann and Tischendorf, [Tregelles, Alford, Conant]; but Meyer defends the sentence. It looks like an exegetical interpolation. [Cod. Sinait. omits the words.]

[5] Ver. 51.—Κύριε is wanting in numerous authorities.

[6] Ver. 52.—[The interpolated words: *Which is*, are better omitted.]

[7] Ver. 52.—Different readings. Τῇ βασιλείᾳ [for εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν] is supported by B., C., K., etc. [Also by Cod. Sinait. which reads: τη βασιλια, substituting ι for ει, as usual in this MS. It is the dative of reference: "instructed *in* the kingdom of heaven."—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 44. **Again, the kingdom of heaven is like to a treasure.**—Tischendorf, following Codd. B., D., etc., omits πάλιν, *again*. But Meyer with good reason defends it. The omission appears to have originated in a stylistic correction. But a consideration of the parables in their connection will convince us that this particle is necessary.—After a general introduction about the parables, the first of them is at once introduced in the form of a simple narrative. This parable is then succeeded by the following well-marked parallelism :—

1) ἄλλην παραβολήν, ver. 24.	1) πάλιν ὁμοία, ver. 44.
2) " " ver. 31.	2) " " ver. 45.
3) " " ver. 33.	3) " " ver. 47.

From the unmistakable antithesis here indicated, we gather that the first three parables—introduced by an ἄλλος—are intended to exhibit the kingdom of heaven under a threefold aspect, being each time presented as more enlarged and universal in its character. And although the third parable bears more particularly upon the unseen efficacy of Christianity, this power is only hid in order afterward to appear all the more glorious in its absolute universality, when the entire mass shall have been leavened by the gospel. It is at this point that the antithesis comes in. Most significantly it is introduced by πάλιν, which seems to point back to the seed hid in the ground, spoken of in the first parable. Shortly before, Christianity had been presented in its universal extent, under the figure of a tree in whose branches the birds sought lodgment, and as humanity leavened by the gospel. Now again the scene is changed, and Christianity is likened unto a treasure hid in the field—to a rare pearl which seems to have disappeared,—nay, even to a draught of fishes concealed in the depths of the sea. [The transition in these parables is very easy and natural : from the seed buried in the ground and the leaven hid in the meal, to the treasure buried in the field; from the treasure to the pearl of great price, the treasure of the deep, which suggests the sea; the fishermen with their net, the mixed throng on the beach, the bank of time, the final separation. Comp. also Alford and Trench.—P. S.]

In the field.—Meyer remarks in reference to the article : "In that particular field in which it lay concealed." But this were mere tautology. The article points out a contrast, showing that the treasure was left there, having no special owner. The circumstance that it lay hid in a field where it would not be looked for, implies that the finder might regard it as a treasure-trove. But there was still a defect about the title to this possession. Accordingly, the finder again hides the treasure, and purchases the field in which he had discovered it. Meyer quotes a similar instance from Bava Mezia, F. 28. 2. R., in which Rabbi Emi purchases a field where he had found a treasure, "*ut pleno jure thesaurum possideret, omnemque litium occasionem præcideret.*" Paulus (*Exeg. Handbuch*, ii. 187) rightly observes : "It would have been foreign to the purpose of this parable, and to the point of the comparison, if Jesus had entered on the question as to the legal right and title to what was found." However, the action of the person who found the treasure is intended to show his strict honesty. The treasure is represented as a lost and unclaimed possession, lying where such a deposit would never be looked for. But as the field itself belonged to another proprietor, the person who found it selleth all that he hath in order to purchase the ground. Even in this view of the matter, however, it is not intended to discuss the absolute right of the case. The notions of right current on such a question, serve as a basis for presenting higher and spiritual relationships.

For joy thereof.—With Erasmus, Luther, Beza, etc., we read αὐτοῦ as the genitive of the object.

Ver. 45. **A merchant.**—In this figure of the kingdom of heaven, the merchant and the goodly pearl must be regarded and treated as a unit. The kingdom of heaven is here exhibited as presenting the contrast of conscious aim, and of the surpassing possession accorded to it.

Ver. 48. **The good fishes.**—Τὰ καλά and σαπρά, here in the same sense as above, in chaps. vii. and xii. Not bad fishes only, but all kinds of unclean sea animals, had got into the net. That such animals are here referred to, and not merely fishes, appears from the contrast between καλόν and σαπρόν—clean or good, and unclean, wild, or whatever is devoted to destruction, whether in the vegetable or in the animal kingdom. To the same conclusion point the words, ἐκ παντὸς γένους συναγαγούσῃ. Bad fishes could scarcely be designated as forming a peculiar γένος. The Aorists in vers. 47 and 48 are used in the *narrative* sense, and not in the sense of habit or custom.

Ver. 52. [**Every scribe,** γραμματεύς.—The Jewish *writer* or *scribe*, סוֹפֵר, a teacher (connected with סֵפֶר, a book), also called νομικός, νομοδιδάσκαλος, is a transcriber and interpreter of the sacred Scriptures of the O. T., a theologian and a lawyer. So the word is used in the Septuagint and in the N. T. Many of them were members of the Sanhedrim, and hence they are often mentioned in connection with the elders and priests. But here, as Meyer correctly suggests, the empirical conception of a *Jewish* scribe is raised to the higher idea of a *Christian* teacher, who

is a *pupil* of the kingdom of heaven: *μαθητευθεὶς τῇ βασ. τ. οὐρ.*, or a disciple of Jesus, as the Jewish scribes were disciples of Moses, xxiii. 2; John ix. 28. The true Christian divine is always learning at the feet of Jesus, and true learning is always connected with childlike docility and humility.—P. S.]

Things new and old.—Olshausen, following many older commentators, applies the expression to the law and the gospel; Meyer, to things hitherto unknown, and to things already known and formerly propounded. The most obvious explanation is, the things of the new world [the Christian order of things] under the figures of the old.*

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The Treasure in the Field.—The following points are clearly laid down in this parable: 1. The kingdom of heaven is represented as having once more become invisible in the visible Church, as hid like a treasure, erst concealed in a most unlikely place (in the midst of worldly things). 2. It appears as a treasure-trove, *i. e.*, as a free gift of grace, discovered by a person in a fortunate hour, though while he was engaged in digging. 3. True Christianity, when again discovered, a subject of great joy. 4. The surrender of all our possessions (of works, of our own righteousness, of the world, and of self) in order to secure this treasure. We first become poor in order to be made rich by the possession of this treasure.—The only difficulty in the parable lies in the statement about buying the field. If "the field" refers to external worldly ecclesiasticism, the expression might mean that we were not to carry the treasure out of the visible Church, as if we were stealing it away; but that we should purchase the field in order to have a full title to the enjoyment of the possession hid in it. Accordingly, it would apply against Novatianism and every other kind of sectarianism. But if the expression included also the mediæval Church, it would of course not imply that we were to become Papists, but that we were to make Catholicism our own, as the symbolical garb under which the gospel was presented,—in other words, that we were to convert all mediæval and legal symbols into evangelical truths and forms of life. (Comp. my work: *The legal Catholic Church a symbol of the free Evangelical Church.*)

2. The Pearl of Great Price.—The following points are plain: He who obtains the kingdom of heaven is no longer represented merely as a fortunate finder, but at the same time as an untiring searcher. He is consciously seeking and striving after goodly pearls, or precious spiritual goods.† At the same time, what was formerly described as a treasure is now characterized as a pearl of great price: it is presented in a concentrated form, as the *one* thing needful, bright and glorious in its appearance,—*i. e.*, the person of Christ, and life in Him, are now all and in all. Accordingly, all former possessions are readily surrendered. Not that everything great and good, which may formerly have been sought or attained, is to be cast away, but that it merges into this new possession and pearl of great price.—The difficulty in this parable lies in the circumstance that the pearl of great price seems to have become matter of merchandize, and, like the jewel of the fable, is found somewhere in a distant part of the world. Probably the meaning of this is, that Christianity is now in the midst of the most active mental life and intercourse, and that the pearl of great price cannot be found without merchandize, *i. e.*, without spiritual intercourse, and moral and earnest aspiration. But when this pearl is discovered, it is made the inmost property of the soul, and our highest ornament: the merchant gives up his business, and has become a prince through his new possession.

3. The Net in the Sea.—The whole Church is now presented in her missionary capacity, as a net cast into the sea of nations. Christianity alone combines the nations of the world, and converts them, so to speak, into one spiritual ocean. The net itself is, of course, only intended to enclose a draught, not to separate its contents. Accordingly, along with the good fishes, unclean sea animals, bad fishes, mud, etc., are brought to land. This exactly applies to the Church in her missionary capacity. Hence the process of separating judgment at the close, which forms the main point in this parable; while in that of the wheat and tares it was only introduced in order to supplement and explain the prohibition addressed by the Lord to His servants. From the circumstance that those to whom the process of separation is entrusted are said to sit down on the shore, and to gather out the good, we infer that "the day of judgment" will be a *season of judgment*, or an æon in the appearing of Christ.

4. The leading idea which pervades the *three last parables* is, that vital Christianity is *concealed* from common view. In the first parable it was represented as hid in a field which sparingly yielded earthly bread—or amid established ecclesiastical order; in the second, we discover it in the course of busy mercantile enterprises, or in the midst of active mental interchange; while in the last parable it appears concealed by the waves and the depths of the sea of life. Similarly, the believer is represented, first, as a husbandman cultivating a field not his own, or, as dependent, without possession of his own in the Church, and only able to acquire anything for himself in his private capacity (in consequence of his own researches and prayer); in the second parable he is described as a merchant, who has entered into active mental and spiritual intercourse; and in the last, under the figure of a fish in the sea, whose new nature and life are safely preserved amid the waves, the dangers, and the unclean animals of the deep. Lastly, we note, that while in the first parable Christianity was characterized as a treasure that had been hid, of undefined, unknown, yet of infinite value; and in the second, as the one pearl of great price; it is set before us in the third as a draught of good fishes—Christianity and Christians being here indissolubly connected and identified. In the first case, the acquisition of the treasure was a happy discovery, granted while the finder was earnestly engaged in the service of works; in the second, it was the highest aim of conscious endeavors; and in the third, it was the experience of the decisive final catastrophe, when Christians are to be separated from the things of the world, put into a clean vessel, and thus made to fulfil their heavenly destiny. Hence also the judgment

* [Doubtful. Better: the old truths reproduced in new and living form from the Bible, from history and from personal experience. In the kingdom of God the old is ever new, and the new old. The old becomes stagnant and dead, if not always renewed and personally applied; the new must be rooted in the old, and grow out of it. Comp. the additions in the Doctrinal and Ethical Notes, sub No. 5.—P. S.]

† [Trench instances Augustine as an example of the diligent seeker and finder, Nathanael and the Samaritan woman as examples of the finders without seeking.—P. S.]

is in this instance exhibited in all its power. In the first parable the judgment was chiefly negative—the land yielded no fruit; in the second parable it was confined to the real authors and representatives of spiritual evil on the earth; while in the third, every kind of unclean animals are doomed to share the fiery judgment awarded to the wicked.

5. THE TRUE SCRIBE.—The expression manifestly applies to Christian teachers, or else to genuine disciples who follow the example of the Lord. The true scribe must bring forth out of his treasure not only things old and dead, but also things new and living—the one along with the other; the new in the garb and in the light of the old, and the old in its fulfilment and development as the new.

[CHR. WORDSWORTH: "Christ in His own parables, precepts, and prayers did not disdain to avail Himself of what was already received in the world. He built His religion on the foundation of the Old Testament, and also on the primeval basis of man's original constitution and nature rightly understood. And He teaches His Apostles and ministers not to reject anything that is true, and therefore of God; but to avail themselves of what is old, in teaching what is new, and, by teaching what is new, to confirm what is old; to show that the gospel is not contrary to the law, and that both are from one and the same source, in harmony with nature, and that one and the same God is the author of them all. God the Father is the original of all; and God the Son, the eternal Logos, who manifests the Father by creation and by revelation,—who made the world and who governs it,—is the dispenser and controller of all." MATTHEW HENRY: "See here (1) what should be a minister's furniture, *a treasure of things new and old.* Those who have so many and various occasions, need to stock themselves well in their gathering days with truths new and old, out of the O. T. and out of the N.; with ancient and modern improvements, *that the man of God may be thoroughly furnished*, 2 Tim. iii. 16, 17. Old experiences and new observations, all have their use; and we must not content ourselves with old discoveries, but must be adding new. Live and learn. (2) What use he should make of this furniture; he should *bring forth:* laying up is in order to laying out, for the benefit of others. *Sic vos non vobis*—you are to lay up, but not for yourselves. Many are full, but they have no vent (Job xxxii. 19), have a talent, but they bury it; such are unprofitable servants. Christ Himself received that He might give; so must we, and we shall have more. In bringing forth things, new and old do best together; old truths, but new methods and expressions, especially new affections."—P. S.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The three parables in their connection: Christianity manifested in a threefold form, and again concealed in a threefold manner.—The divine invisibility of the Church concealed under its worldly visibility.—Christianity the great revelation, and yet the great mystery in the world, to the end of time, 1 Tim. iii. 16.

1. THE TREASURE IN THE FIELD.—True Christianity ever again like an unexpected discovery, even in the ancient Church.—The best possession we can find, a gift of free grace.—Every one must find and discover Christianity for himself.—Description of him who found the heavenly treasure of a free gospel in the earthly field of the Church. 1. *What he may have been:* one who had taken the field for a time, and was busily employed upon it (engaged in earnest endeavors after righteousness); or else a miner, who may have anticipated the possibility of some discovery; but certainly not an indolent person engaged in digging for treasures. 2. *What he certainly was*. most faithful in his labors, and happy in his discovery; finding something for which he had not wrought, nor even sought.—In order to secure possession even of what we have found, without any merit of our own, we must be willing to sacrifice all; or, salvation, though entirely of free grace, requires the fullest self-surrender.

Starke:—Marginal note of Luther: The hidden treasure is the gospel, which bestows upon us all the riches of free grace, without any merit of our own. Hence also the joy when it is found, and which consists in a good and happy conscience, that cannot be obtained by works. This gospel is likewise the pearl of great price.—*Hedinger:* Let us hazard everything—honor, possessions, and life—for the sake of the gospel, which so far surpasses everything else in value. What were temporal possessions without this treasure! comp. vi. 26.—If we lose Christ, then indeed all is lost; but if Christ be found, nothing can be said to be lost.—He who has Christ as his own is rich indeed, and may well rejoice.

Braune:—He was silent about his discovery. By silence the kingdom of God is most effectually promoted. (Yet there is a time for speech and a time for silence.)

Lisco:—Learn to understand and know this mark of the kingdom of heaven. It always seemeth as if he possessed it who possesses it not, and again as if he possessed it not who really possesses it. The treasure is hid, etc.

Gerlach:—In order to be certain of our possession of the kingdom of heaven, let us first seek inward assurance of our part in it by faith, before we come forward openly, lest we lose everything.—Not, as if we could purchase or acquire for ourselves the kingdom of God.—Self-abnegation is always requisite. Only, it must be of free choice and willingly, not of constraint.

Heubner:—The treasure is *lost.* 1. The natural man knows not its character or value; 2. the world does not care for it; 3. it can only be received by and in the heart.—Where is it concealed? In the field: the visible Church, or else the word.*—Comp. *Muslin*, Sermon iv. on Col. iii. 3, "Your life is hid with Christ in God" (although this is a different thought).

2. THE PEARL OF GREAT PRICE.—Without spiritual aspirations, Christian life is impossible.—Christianity the necessary goal of all true aspirations of the soul.—If we have been awakened to true, inward aspirations, we shall not be satisfied with anything less than *goodly* pearls: 1. We shall seek genuine spiritual possessions; 2. such as are simple, most precious, and yet easily preserved; 3. which never lose their value.—Christianity under the figure of a merchant: 1. The man and his calling (he takes pleasure in his business, and carries it on with enthusiasm, not as a hired laborer). 2. His object: to find goodly pearls. What he wishes to avoid—spurious pearls; what he scarcely dares anticipate—the pearl of great price. 3. His discovery: far surpassing his hopes. 4. His resolution: to give up his

* [Not *world*, as the Edinb. translation has it. Heubner means the Bible, as containing the treasure of truth.—P. S.]

merchandize, and to retire, enjoying his new princely possession.—The goodly pearl: the person of Christ, all in one.—This pearl reflects both the waters of the world and the brightness of heaven.—On the dangers and the blessings connected with the rapid mental interchange of modern times.—True disciples combine the gracious and free gift of life from above with earnest seeking and striving after heavenly blessings. —Who has discovered the goodly pearl? He that has found the Lord in His gospel, that has found himself in the election of grace, and that has found both heaven and earth, by finding and experiencing *the love of God.*

Starke :—*Quesnel* : Merchants who go from one end of the earth to the other, and venture everything in search of worldly gain, may well put to shame many Christians who care so little for the Lord, and their own salvation.—*Osiander* : Men often at great cost buy pearls and jewels, which cannot save them from death; but the gospel, etc.—*One thing is needful*, Luke x. 42.—*Zeisius* : Oh wise diligence! Oh blessed discovery!—To adorn the body with pearls, but to forget the pearl of great price, will bring to shame in the day of judgment.—*Gossner* : Christ—truth—peace—a pearl of great price indeed.—*Lisco* : The transcendent value of the kingdom of heaven. —*Heubner* : In the first parable the discovery was, so to speak, a matter of good fortune, while in the present instance the merchant is busy searching for pearls.—Souls awakened (Justin Martyr).—Christ in us is the pearl of great price.

3. The Net cast into the Sea. — The whole Church of Christ essentially missionary in its character.—The net encloses every species, both good and bad.—First they are gathered, and then separated.—For a season souls are at the same time in the sea and in the net: 1. In the sea, and yet in the net; 2. in the net, and yet in the sea.—The whole world drawn to the shore of eternity in the net of the Church.—Ultimately, it is not the net, but the draught of fishes, which is of importance.—The kingdom of heaven in the Church at the end of the world: 1. The whole world *one* sea; 2. the entire Church *one* net; 3. the whole kingdom of heaven *one* draught of fishes. —The separation of the clean from the unclean: 1. It is not done precipitately (only when the net is full); 2. nor tumultuously (they sit down and gather); 3. but carefully (the good into vessels); and, 4. decisively (the bad are cast away); 5. universally.—Fiery judgments descending upon sinners. — The gnashing of teeth of the condemned shows that their wailing is not weeping.—Those who are finally cast away cannot truly weep.

Starke :—*Quesnel* : In the net of the divine word souls are drawn from the depths of error and sin into faith and blessedness.—The world as resembling a tempest-tossed sea, Isa. lvi. 20.—The fishermen are the ministers of the gospel.—*Hedinger* : Bad fishes, or hypocrites, will be found even in the holiest assemblage.—Everybody wishes to appear pious, and none likes to be thought godless; but the day of judgment will disclose the true character of men.—The net is still in the sea.—*Heubner* : The kingdom of heaven here means the apostolic or ministerial office in the Church. (This is too narrow. It is the Church as an institution of grace.)

4. The True Scribe.—"Have ye understood all these things?"—The parable about the parable.—The scribe instructed in the kingdom of heaven.—The living treasury containing old, and ever sending forth new treasures.—Defects and dangers of common religious instruction: 1. It presents the old without the new; 2. or the new without the old; or, 3. fails to exhibit the proper relationship between them. —The ministerial office a constant "bringing forth:" 1. Presupposing a continual receiving from on high; as, 2. again manifesting itself by a right "bringing forth" (of wise, fresh, and rich instruction).

Starke :—Let teachers frequently examine their pupils.—The kingdom of heaven must form the central-point of all theological learning. *Nov. Bibl. Tub.* —*Majus* : Approved teachers are only trained in the school of Christ and of the Holy Spirit.

Lisco :—The ability and the activity of a true teacher.

Gerlach :—Everything connected with the kingdom of heaven is at the same time *old* and *new*.

Heubner :—Jesus the model for all preachers.—Love the secret of true popularity.—Rhetorical figures and worldly oratory is what many hearers most admire.—Authentic definition here given of what constitutes a good divine: his inspirations are drawn from Scripture (he is instructed in the kingdom of heaven, and bound to extend it. All science and learning which do not tend to the furtherance of Christ's kingdom cannot be divine); his treasure (things new and old. He learns from others and draws from his own resources, finding in his meditation and spiritual experience things both new and old).—On the danger of preaching oneself empty [by neglecting and despising the old, or by ceasing to produce new thoughts and sermons].

THIRD SECTION.

CHRIST MANIFESTS HIMSELF AS THE HIGH PRIEST IN HIS SUFFERINGS; BEING REJECTED—(A.) BY HIS OWN CITY NAZARETH.

Chapter XIII. 53–58 (Mark vi. 1–6; Luke iv. 14–30).

53 And it came to pass, *that*[1] when Jesus had finished these parables [of the kingdom of
54 heaven], he departed thence. And when he was come [having come, ἐλθών] into his
own country,[2] he taught them in their synagogue, insomuch [so] that they were astonished, and said, Whence hath this *man* this wisdom, and *these* mighty works [the mir
55 acles]?[3] Is not this the carpenter's son? is not his mother called Mary? and his bre-

56 thren [brothers],[4] James, and Joses [Joseph],[5] and Simon, and Judas? And his sis-
57 ters, are they not all with us? Whence then hath this *man* all these things? And
they were offended in [at] him. But Jesus said unto them, A prophet is not without
58 honour, save in his own country, and in his own house. And he did not many mighty
works [miracles] there because of their unbelief.

[1] Ver. 53.—[*That* is an unnecessary interpolation placed before *when* in Cranmer's and James's versions, or before *he departed* by Tyndale and the Geneva Bible, and is omitted by Wiclif, the N. T. of Rheims, also by Conant in his work on Matthew, but restored before *he departed*, in the revised Vers. of the Am. Bible Union.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 54.—[Lange, as also de Wette, Ewald, and others, translate πατρίδα here: *Vaterstadt*, paternal (maternal) *town*, for *Vaterland* (Luther), father*land*. Nazareth is meant as the residence of his mother and reputed father. Euthym. Zigab.: λέγει τὴν Ναζαρὲτ, ὡς πατρίδα τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ νομιζομένου πατρὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὡς τραφεὶς ἐν αὐτῇ.—P. S.]

[3] Ver. 54.—[Αἱ δυνάμεις, de Wette: *die Wunder;* Lange: *die Wunderkräfte;* Ewald: *die Heilmächte.* Comp. the note on xi. 20, p. 210. The definite article here is more emphatic than the demonstrative pronoun of the E. V. —P. S.]

[4] Ver. 55.—[Comp. my note on xii. 46, p. 231.—P. S.]

[5] Ver. 55.—B., C., and several translations read Ἰωσήφ. So Lachmann, Tischendorf. Many uncial MSS. D., E., F., G., etc., Ἰωάννης;—K., L., etc., Ἰωσῆς. In the parallel passage of Mark the reading *Joses* is by far better supported than *Joseph*. According to Lightfoot the Talmudists write יוסי for יוסף. Perhaps the person in question was called by both names already in the apostolic age. [Dr. Lange, in his German translation, retains *Joses* from the received text. But *Joseph* is undoubtedly the true reading according to the ancient authorities, including Cod. Sinaiticus, and is adopted also by Meyer, Tregelles, Alford, Conant. The reading has some bearing on the question concerning the brothers of Christ. For if Ἰωσήφ be the true reading, there remains but one brother of Christ, viz. James, of the same name with one of the two sons of Mary, the wife of Alphæus (supposed to be the same with Cleophas), ch. xxvii. 56 ("Mary the mother of *James* and *Joses*"); and this argues against the view defended by Dr. Lange, that the brothers of Christ were merely his cousins. *See* below.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

According to Schleiermacher and many others, the passage before us is identical with Luke iv. 16. But this view is controverted by Wieseler, Ewald, and Meyer. The opinion of Schleiermacher is, however, supported by the fact, that in both passages the people of Nazareth are described as putting the question: Is not this the carpenter's son, or the son of Joseph? and that in both cases the Saviour replies that a prophet is not without honor, etc. But the chronological arrangement seems to be rightly given by Luke, as his narrative fully accounts for the removal of Jesus to Capernaum. Matthew indeed furnishes different details as to the time and circumstances of this occurrence (vers. 53, 54). But we would suggest as probable, that the Lord may, after His controversy with the Pharisees, have retired for a time with His disciples into the mountains and to Nazareth. This may explain the introduction of this narrative. When recording the stay at Nazareth, Matthew, in his usual pragmatic method, also relates some events which had formerly taken place there. At the same time, it will be observed that the Evangelist only states the great outlines of this conflict of Jesus with His fellow-citizens, without repeating the details connected with it.

Ver. 54. **His own city.**—On the situation of Nazareth, and the meaning of the word, comp. the Exegetical Notes on ch. ii. 23.

Whence hath this man?—τούτῳ. By way of contempt, as if they were inquiring what schools He had attended while in their city.

Ver. 55. **The carpenter's son.**—The word τέκτων (*artifex*), *faber lignarius* in the widest sense (carpenter, wright, etc.).

[The occupation of a carpenter was always regarded as an honorable and respectable employment; hence this question was not a question of contempt, but of surprise. The Nazarenes regarded Jesus not as their inferior, but themselves as His equals, and doubted only His claim to superiority, which was forced upon them by His wisdom and miracles. It is the same natural surprise which is always felt if an old acquaintance meets his former humble associates with a distinguished rank or reputation as a scholar, or artist, or statesman, or merchant-prince.—P. S.]

A prophet.—A fact of experience—exculpatory in its general bearing, but condemnatory in its special application in this instance.

Ver. 58. **He did not many miracles.**—Mark: "He *could* there do no mighty works;" *i. e.*, He found them not prepared to receive, and therefore would not as He could not. The latter expression indicates not a want of power, but the moral limits which Himself imposed on the exercise of His power. However, it also implies that we are not to regard these displays of Christ's power as merely the manifestations of absolute might.

Ver. 55–57. **The brothers of Jesus.**

Matt. xiii. 55. James, Joses,* Simon, Judas (Mark vi. 3).
Mark xv. 40. James the Less, Joses, their mother Mary.
John xix. 25. (Mary the wife of Cleophas.)

The Apostles.

Matt. x. 3.	James (the son of Alphæus or Cleophas).	Simon Zelotes.	Lebbeus (Thaddeus) (or Judas, the brother of James. Luke vi. 16).
Acts i. 13.	James, the son of Alphæus.	Simon Zelotes.	Judas, the brother of James.

From the above we conclude:

(1.) That three brothers of the Lord bore the names of James, Simon, and Judas;

That three Apostles also bore the names of James, Simon, and Judas:

(2.) That James, the brother of the Lord, had a brother called Joses [Joseph];

That the Apostle James, the son of Alphæus, had a brother called Joses:

(3.) That the father of the Apostle James the Less bore the name of Alphæus;

* [Or rather Joseph. *See* the critical note above.—P. S.]

That the father of Joses, the son of Mary, bore the name of Alphæus:

(4.) That the Apostle Judas had a brother called James;

That Judas, the brother of Jesus, had a brother called James:

(5.) That the wife of Clopas or Cleophas was called Mary, and that she was the mother of James and Joses.

(6.) Hence that

Cleophas was the father of James and Joses;
" " " of the Apostle James;
" " " of Judas, the brother of James.

(7.) Besides, we have Simon, { Brother of the Lord; Brother of James (brother of the Lord); Apostle of the Lord.

Manifestly, then, the brothers of the Lord and the Apostles whom we have just named are identical. The relationship existing between them was probably as follows: Clopas (Cleophas), or Alphæus, was a brother of Joseph, the foster-father of Jesus (Eusebius, iii. 11). It is a mistake to suppose that Mary the wife of Cleophas was the sister of the mother of the Lord.* Alphæus probably died early [?], and Joseph [the poor carpenter?] adopted his family [of at least six children? and this, when their mother was still living, John xix. 25?—P. S.]; so that the cousins of Jesus became His adopted brothers, and in the eye of the law were treated as His brothers. Probably they were older than Jesus, and hence appear to have interfered on several occasions with His work. Although at an early period they were in the faith, some time elapsed before they attained to full obedience. Besides these sons, Alphæus seems also to have left daughters [?].

The idea that the Apostles James the Less and Judas were different from the brothers of the Lord, originated among the Judæo-Christian sect of the Ebionites. The oldest Catholic tradition, on the contrary, has always regarded them as identical (Hegesippus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen).† For further particulars, *see* my article *Jakobus* in Herzog's *Real Encyclop.* [vol. vi., p. 406 sqq. Comp. also ALFORD *on Matt.* xiii. 55; Dr. MILL: *On the Brethren of our Lord* (quoted by Alford and Wordsworth, as defending the cousin-theory), and SAM. S. ANDREWS: *The Life of our Lord*, N. Y., 1863, p. 104 sqq.—P. S.]

[NOTE ON THE BROTHERS OF JESUS.—After a renewed investigation of this difficult exegetical and historical problem, I beg leave to differ from the cousin-theory, even in the modified form so plausibly defended by Dr. Lange here and elsewhere. I shall present as clearly and concisely as I can the principal *exegetical* data in the case, on which the right conclusion must be based. For a fuller treatment I refer to my monograph on *James* (Berlin, 1842), where the whole subject is discussed exegetically and historically, with special reference to James the brother of the Lord and his relation to James the Less. (Compare also my *History of the Apostolic Church*, p. 378, and the notes in previous parts of this Commentary, on ch. i. 25; xii. 46, 47; xiii. 55 above.)

1. The *brothers* of Jesus, four in number, and bearing the names Jacob or James, Joseph (or Joses), Simon, and Jude, are mentioned with or without their names, fourteen or fifteen times in the N. T. (not *ten* times, as Alford *in loc.* says), twice in connection with *sisters* (whose number and names are not recorded), viz., twelve times in the Gospels, Matt. xii. 46, 47; xiii. 55, 56 (ἀδελφοί and ἀδελφαί); Mark iii. 31, 32; vi. 3 (here the *sisters* are likewise introduced); Luke viii. 19, 20; John vii. 3, 5, 10;—once in the Acts, i. 14;—and once by St. Paul, 1 Cor. ix. 5, to which must be added Gal. i. 19, where James of Jerusalem is called "*the brother of the Lord*." Besides, the Saviour Himself speaks several times of His brothers (brethren), but apparently in a wider sense of the term, Matt. xii. 48, 49, 50; Mark iii. 33, 34, 35; Matt. xxviii. 10; John xx. 17.

In the former fourteen or fifteen passages it is agreed on all hands that the term *brothers* must be taken more or less literally of natural affinity, and not metaphorically or spiritually, in which sense all Christians are brethren. The question is only, whether the term means brothers proper, or cousins, according to a somewhat wider usage of the Hebrew אָח.

2. The exegetical or grammatical (though not perhaps the dogmatical) *a priori* presumption is undoubtedly in favor of the usual meaning of the word, the more so since no parallel case of a wider meaning of ἀδελφός (except the well-known and always apparent metaphorical, which is out of the question in our case), can be quoted from the New Testament. Even the Hebrew אָח is used only twice in a wider sense, and then only extended to *nephew* (not to *cousin*), viz., Gen. xiii. 8; xiv. 16; of Abraham and Lot, who was his brother's son (xi. 27, 31), and Gen. xxix. 12, 15, of Laban and Jacob his sister's son (comp. ver. 13). Here there can be no mistake. The cases are therefore not strictly parallel with ours.

3. There is no mention anywhere of *cousins* or *kinsmen* of Jesus according to the flesh; and yet the term ἀνεψιός, *consobrinus*, *cousin*, is well known to the N. T. vocabulary (compare Col. iv. 10, where Mark is called a cousin of Barnabas); so also the more exact term υἱὸς τῆς ἀδελφῆς, *sister's son* (comp. Acts xxiii. 26, of Paul's cousin in Jerusalem); and the more general term συγγενής, *kinsman*, *relative*, occurs not less than eleven times (Mark vi. 4; Luke i. 36, 58; ii. 44; xiv. 12; xxi. 16; John xviii. 26; Acts x. 24; Rom. ix. 3; xvi. 7, 11, 21).

Now, if the *brothers of Jesus* were merely His cousins (either sons of a sister of Mary, as is generally assumed, or of a brother of Joseph, as Dr. Lange maintains), the question may well be asked: Why in the name of sense did the sacred historians never call them by their right name, ἀνεψιοί, or υἱοὶ τῆς ἀδελφῆς τῆς Μαρίας, or τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ τοῦ Ἰωσήφ, or at least more generally συγγενεῖς?* By doing this they would have at once prevented all future confusion among commentators; while by uniformly using the term ἀδελφοί, without the least intimation of a wider meaning, they certainly suggest to every unbiased reader the impression that real brothers are intended.

4. In all the passages where *brothers* and *sisters*

* Comp. Wieseler in the *Studien und Kritiken* for 1840, p. 648: "There stood by the cross of Jesus His mother, and the sister of His mother—*i. e.*, Salome—, Mary the wife of Cleophas, and Mary Magdalene." John xix. 25. Comp. Mark xv. 40; Matt. xxvii. 56.

† [But it must be added, that the oldest tradition, including the most distinguished Greek and Latin fathers, as Origen, Gregory of Nyssa, Cyril of Alexandria, Epiphanius, Hilary, and Ambrose, regarded the brothers of Christ as sons of Joseph by a former marriage. *See* the passages in full in my book on James, p. 80 sqq.—P. S.]

* Hegesippus (ap. Euseb. H. E. iv. 22) speaks of cousins of Christ, calling Simeon, the successor of James in Jerusalem: ἀνεψιὸν τοῦ Κυρίου δεύτερον.

of Jesus are mentioned, except in John vii. (where they are represented in conflict with the Lord), and 1 Cor. ix. (which was written probably after the death of Mary), they appear in close connection with Him and His mother Mary as being under her care and direction, and as forming one family. This is certainly surprising and unaccountable, if they were cousins. Why do they never appear in connection with their own supposed mother, Mary the wife of Clopas (or Alphæus), who was living all the time, and stood under the cross (Matt. xxvii. 56; John xix. 25), and at the sepulchre (Matt. xxvii. 61)?

Lange calls to his aid the double hypothesis of an early death of Clopas (whom he assumes to have been the brother of Joseph*), and the adoption of his children by the parents of Jesus, so that they became legally His brothers and sisters. But this adoption, if true, could not destroy their relation to their natural mother, Mary, who was still living, and one of the most faithful female followers of Christ. Besides, both the assumption of the early death of Clopas and the adoption of his children by Joseph, is without the shadow of either exegetical or traditionary evidence, and is made extremely improbable by the fact of the poverty of the holy family, who could not in justice to themselves and to their own Son adopt at least half a dozen children at once (four sons and two or more daughters), especially when their own mother was still living at the time. We would have to assume that the mother likewise, after the death of her husband, lived with the holy family. But would she have given up in this case, or under any circumstances, the claim and title to, and the maternal care of, her own children? Certainly not. The more we esteem this devoted disciple, who attended the Saviour to the cross and the sepulchre (Matt. xxvii. 56, 61; John xix. 25), the less we can think her capable of such an unmotherly and unwomanly act.

5. There is no intimation anywhere in the New Testament, either by direct assertion or by implication (unless it be the disputed passage on James, in Gal. i. 19), that the brothers of Christ, or any of them, were of the number of the twelve Apostles. This is a mere *inference* from certain facts and combinations, which we shall consider afterward, viz., the identity of three names, James, Simon and Judas, who occur among the brothers of Christ and among the Apostles, and the fact that a certain Mary, supposed to be an aunt of Jesus, was the mother of James and Joses (but she is never called the mother of James, Joseph, Simon, and Jude), and with the fact of the eminent, Apostle-like position of James, the brother of the Lord, in the church at Jerusalem.

6. On the contrary, the brothers of Jesus are mentioned *after* the Apostles, and thus *distinguished* from them. In Acts i. 13, 14, Luke first enumerates the eleven by name, and then adds: "These all [the Apostles] continued with one accord in prayer and supplication, with the women, and Mary the mother of Jesus, and with *His brethren*." Here they seem to form a distinct class with their mother, next to the Apostles. So also 1 Cor. ix. 5: *οἱ λοιποὶ ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ τοῦ Κυρίου*. Such distinct mention of the brothers after the Apostles was not justified if three of the four, as is assumed by the cousin-theory, were themselves Apostles; consequently, only one remained to make a separate class. The narrative, Matt. xii. 46–50, likewise implies that the brothers of Jesus who stood without, seeking to speak with Him, were distinct from the disciples (ver. 69), who always surrounded Him.

7. More than this: before the resurrection of Christ, His brothers are represented in the Gospel of John, in ch. vii. 3–10, long after the call of the Apostles, as *unbelievers*, who endeavored to embarrass the Saviour and to throw difficulties in His way. This makes it *morally impossible* to identify them with the Apostles. Even if only one or two of the four had been among the twelve *at that time*, John could not have made the unqualified remark: "*Neither did His brethren* (*brothers*) *believe in Him*" (vii. 5); for faith is the very first condition of the apostolate. Nor would Christ in this case have said to them: "My time has not yet come; but your time is always ready; the world cannot hate you; but Me it hateth" (vers. 6, 7); nor would He have separated from them in His journey to Jerusalem. It will not do here to weaken the force of *πιστεύειν*, and to reduce their unbelief to a mere temporary wavering and uncertainty. The case of Peter, Matt. xvi. 23, and that of Thomas, John xx. 25, are by no means parallel. The whole attitude of the brothers of Christ, as viewed by Christ and described by John, is entirely inconsistent with that of an apostle. It is an attitude not of enemies, it is true, but of doubtful, dissatisfied friends, who assume an air of superiority, and presume to suggest to Him a worldly and ambitious policy. After the resurrection they are expressly mentioned among the believers, but as a distinct class with Mary, next to the Apostles.

All these considerations strongly urge the conclusion that the brothers of Christ were real brothers, according to the flesh, *i. e.*, either later sons of Mary and Joseph, or sons of Joseph by a former marriage (more of this below), unless there are very serious difficulties in the way, which make this conclusion either critically, or morally, or religiously impossible.

Let us now approach these difficulties.

8. There are serious but no insurmountable objections to the conclusion just stated.

(*a*) The first objection is the identity in *name* of three of these brothers with three of the Apostles, viz., James, Simon, and Jude.* But it should be remembered that these were among the most common Jewish names. Josephus mentions no less than twenty-one Simons, seventeen Joses's, and sixteen Judes. Why could there not be two or three persons of the same name in the apostolic Church? We have at all events two James's, two Simons, and two Judes among the twelve Apostles. This difficulty is more than counterbalanced by the opposite difficulty of two sisters with the same name.

(*b*) The second objection, likewise of a critical and exegetical character, is derived from Gal. i. 19: "But other of the Apostles saw I none, save (*εἰ μή*) James, the Lord's brother." Here James, who was one of the brothers of Jesus, seems to be included

* Hegesippus (in Eusebius' H. E. iii. 11) asserts that Clopas was the brother of Joseph. Lange denies that Mary, the wife of Clopas, was the sister of the Virgin Mary. But Lichtenstein (*Lebensgeschichte des Herrn*, Erlangen, 1856, p. 124) assumes, that the two brothers, Joseph and Clopas, married two sisters, both named Mary. Clopas dying, Joseph took his wife and her children into his family. Schneckenburger reverses the hypothesis and assumes that Mary, after the early death of Joseph, moved to the household of her sister, the wife of Clopas.

* Dr. Lange, in his article *Jakobus* in Herzog's *Encycl.*, vol. vi., p. 412, calls this *die Unhaltbarkeit einer dreinamigen Doppelgängerlinie in dem apostolischen Kreise*, and afterward *eine unerhörte zwei- bis vierfache Doppelgängerei*.

among the Apostles, and this must have been James of Alphæus, or James the Less.* But the passage bears the exactly opposite interpretation, if after εἰ μή we supply simply: εἶδον, and not εἶδον τὸν ἀπόστολον, viz.: "I saw none other of the Apostles (besides Peter, ver. 18), but only (I saw) James, the Lord's brother." This interpretation is very old,† and is defended by some of the highest grammatical authorities of our age.‡ I think with Meyer § that James is here distinguished from the twelve to whom Peter belonged, and yet at the same time mentioned with the Apostles in a *wider* sense of the term. In other words, he is represented as a man who, on account of his close natural relationship to Christ, and of his weight of character and piety, enjoyed an apostolic dignity and authority among the strict Jewish Christians. He was the acknowledged head and leader of this branch and the first bishop of Jerusalem, where he permanently resided and died, while the apostles proper were not fixed in a particular diocese, but traveling missionaries, with the whole world for their field of labor. That this was precisely the position of James is evident from various passages in the Acts, in the epistle to the Galatians, from Josephus, Hegesippus, and the traditions of the Eastern Church."‖

(*c*) The third objection is of a *moral* character, and derived from the consideration that Christ on the cross could not have commended His mother to the care of John if she had other sons (John xix. 26, 27). "But why," we may ask with Andrews,¶ "if James and Judas were Apostles and His cousins, sons of her sister and long inmates of her family, and it was a question of kinship, did He not commend her to *their* care?" The difficulty then remains, and must be solved on other grounds. The brothers of Jesus at that time, as appears from John vii., were not yet full believers in Christ, although they must have been converted soon after the resurrection (Acts i. 14). Moreover, John was the most intimate bosom friend of the Saviour, and could better sympathize with Mary, and comfort her in this peculiar trial than any human being. If the modern interpretation of John xix. 25 be correct, as it probably is, Salome (not Mary, wife of Clopas) was a sister of Christ's mother, consequently John His cousin. But we would not urge this as an additional reason of the commendation, which must be based on a deeper spiritual affinity and sympathy.

(*d*) The fourth objection is *religious* and *dogmatical*, arising from the pious or superstitious belief in the perpetual virginity of Mary, and the apparent impropriety of the birth of any later descendants of the house of David after the birth of the Messiah. The perpetual virginity of the mother of our Saviour is an article of faith in the Greek and Roman Church; it is taught also in a few of the older Protestant symbols,* and held to this day by many evangelical divines. Bishop Pearson says that the Church of God in all ages has maintained that Mary continued in the same virginity.† Olshausen takes the same view, and Lange, though the latter only as far as offspring is concerned. Dr. Jos. Addison Alexander, a Presbyterian, who will not be accused of any sympathy with Romanism, says with apparent approbation: "Multitudes of Protestant divines and others, independently of all creeds and confessions, have believed, or rather felt, that the selection of a woman to be the mother of the Lord, carries with it as a necessary implication that no others could sustain the same relation to her; and that the selection of a virgin still more necessarily implied that she was to continue so; for if there be nothing in the birth of younger children inconsistent with her maternal relation to the Saviour, why should there be any such repugnance in the birth of older children likewise? . . . The same feeling which revolts from one hypothesis in some, revolts from both hypotheses in both."‡

A doctrine or feeling so old and widely spread must be treated with proper regard and delicacy. But it should be observed:

In the first place, that these doctrinal objections hold only against the view that the brothers of Christ were younger children of Mary, not against the other alternative left, that they were older children of Joseph by a former marriage.

Secondly, the virginity of Mary can be made an article of faith only as far as it is connected with the mystery of the supernatural conception and the absolute freedom of Christ from hereditary as well as actual sin. But neither His nor her honor require the *perpetual* virginity after His birth, unless there be something impure and unholy in the marriage relation itself. The latter we cannot admit, since God instituted marriage in the state of innocence in Paradise, and St. Paul compares it to the most sacred relation existing, the union of Christ with His Church.

Thirdly, the Apostles and Evangelists, who are certainly much safer guides in all matters of faith and religious feeling than even fathers and reformers, seem to have had no such feeling of repugnance to a real marriage between Joseph and Mary, since they not only frequently mention brothers and sisters of Christ, without any intimation of an unusual or indefinite sense of the word, but Matthew and Luke (ii. 7) call Christ the *first*-born son of Mary, and Matthew moreover says (i. 25), that Joseph knew not Mary, *i. e.*, did not cohabit with her as man and wife, till she had brought forth her first-born son. I admit that neither πρωτότοκος nor ἕως οὗ are conclusive in favor of subsequent cohabitation and offspring, but they naturally look that way, especially in a retrospective historical narrative, and in connection with the subsequent frequent mention of the brothers and sisters of

* So Schneckenburger on the Epistle of James, and all the commentators on Galatians who adopt the cousin-hypothesis, also Ellicott *ad Gal.* i. 19, who, however, does not enter into a discussion of the general question.

† Victorinus, in his Commentary *in loc.*, says: "Paul disclaims James as an apostle, saying, that he saw no other apostle besides Peter, but only James."

‡ Winer, *Grammatik*, 6th ed., p. 557 (§ 67, sub I. e); who quotes for a similar use of εἰ μή Acts xxvii. 22 and Rev. xxi. 27; Fritzsche, *Comment. in Matt.*, p. 482, who translates: *alium apostolum non vidi, sed vidi Jacobum;* Bleek (in *Studien und Kritiken* for 1836, p. 1059), and, as to the inference drawn, also Meyer and Hilgenfeld *ad Gal.* i. 19.

§ In his Comment. on Gal. i. 19.

‖ This subject is fully discussed in my book on James.

¶ *The Life of our Lord upon the Earth*, p. 115.

* The Articles of Smalkald, Pars. I. art. IV. (p. 303, ed. Hase): "Ex Maria pura, sancta, *semper virgine*." The Form of Concord, p. 767: "Unde et vere θεοτόκος, Dei genetrix est, et tamen *virgo mansit*." Even Zwingli shared in this view, *Comment. in Matt.* i. 18, 25, and the Helvetic Confession speaks of Jesus as "natus ex Maria *semper virgine*."

† Exposition of the Creed, art. III.

‡ Commentary on Matthew, xiii. 56, pp. 383 and 384, and in the same language, Com. on Mark vi. 3. Dr. Alexander does not decide one way or the other (though leaning to the cousin-theory), and thinks that the difference of taste and sensibility on this subject is likely to continue to affect the interpretation until the question has received some new and unequivocal solution.

Christ by the same writers. At all events, we are warranted to say that those terms could not have been used by the Evangelists if they had regarded legitimate cohabitation as essentially profane, or in any way degrading to Joseph and His mother. The Old Testament, it is well known, nowhere sustains the ascetic Romish views on the superior merits of celibacy, and represents children as the greatest blessing, and sterility as a curse or misfortune.

Finally, it may be regarded as another proof of the true and full humanity and the condescending love of our Saviour, if He shared the common trials of family life in all its forms, and moved a brother among brothers and sisters, that "He might be touched with a feeling of our infirmities." This last consideration, however, has its full weight if we adopt Dr. Lange's modification of the cousin-hypothesis, viz., the formal adoption of Christ's cousins into the holy family.

9. It remains to be seen whether the cousin-theory is more free from difficulties. This theory is very old, and goes back not only to Jerome, as is generally stated, but even to Papias, at the beginning of the second century,* probably also to Hegesippus, although this may be disputed, and has the authority of the whole Latin Church, and the older Protestant divines, who, however, paid very little attention to this question.† But this theory did not obtain credit and currency without an undue weight of dogmatical considerations connected with the perpetual virginity of Mary and the superior sanctity of celibacy (as is very evident from Jerome's work against Helvidius). It has moreover to contend with all the facts presented under No. 1–7, which are as many arguments against it. And finally it has to call to its aid two assumptions, which are at least very doubtful, and give the theory an intricate and complicated character. These assumptions are:

(*a*) That Mary, the mother of James and Joses (Matt. xxvii. 56; Mark xv. 40), was a sister of the Virgin Mary, and that consequently her children were cousins of Jesus. But who ever heard of two sisters bearing the same name without any additional one by which to distinguish them? Then, the only passage on which the alleged relationship of the two Marys is based, John xix. 25, admits of a different and more probable explanation, by which the term "His mother's sister" is applied to Salome,‡ who stood certainly under the cross (*see* Matt. xxvii. 56; Mark xv. 40), and could not well be passed by in silence by her own son, St. John, while he, with his accustomed modesty and delicacy, omitted her name, and intimated her presence by bringing out her relation to Mary.

(*b*) That Clopas, or Cleophas, the husband of Mary, the supposed sister of the Virgin Mary, is the same with Alphæus, the father of James, the younger Apostle of that name, who is called Ἰάκωβος ὁ τοῦ Ἀλφαίου (Matt. x. 3; Mark ii. 14; iii. 18; Luke vi. xv; Acts i. 13). But this, though not improbable, and supported by the testimony of Papias, is at least not certain. Besides, Matthew (or Levi) was also a son of Alphæus, Mark ii. 14, and if Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου, and Simeon, two of the twelve, were likewise among the brothers of Christ, we would have four Apostles, of whom it is said in John vii. that they did not believe. Finally, Mary, it should be remembered, is called the mother of James and Joses only, but never the mother of Simon and Jude, the other two brothers of Jesus, and both of them supposed to have been Apostles, which Joses was not. It is nowhere intimated that she had more sons than two, or any daughters at all; and even from her two sons, one, Joses, must be exempt from being a namesake, since *Joseph*, and not *Joses*, according to the correct reading, in Matt. xiii. 55, is the second brother of Christ.

Dr. Lange, it is true, avoids some of these difficulties by giving up the sisterhood of the two Marys, and assuming in its place the brotherhood of Clopas, or Alphæus, and Joseph,* as the basis of the cousinship of their sons, and calling to his aid the additional hypothesis of the early death of Alphæus and the adoption of his children into the holy family,—but all this without a shadow of exegetical proof. The absence of all allusion in the Evangelists to Mary, the real and still living mother of these children, when they are collectively mentioned, is a surprising fact, which speaks as strongly against Lange's hypothesis as against the older and usual form of the cousin-theory.

10. We conclude, therefore, that the strict grammatical explanation of the term *brothers* and *sisters* of Christ, though not without difficulties, is still far more easy and natural than the explanation which makes them mere cousins.

But from the exegetical data of the New Testament we are still at liberty to choose between two views:

(*a*) The brothers of Jesus were *younger children of Joseph and Mary*, and hence His *uterine* brothers, though in fact only half-brothers, since He had no human father, and was conceived by the Holy Spirit overshadowing the Blessed Virgin. This view may be supported by the ἕως and the πρωτότοκος in Matt. i. 25 and Luke ii. 7, and has been adopted by Tertullian, Helvidius, and many modern Protestant divines of Germany, as Herder, Neander, Winer, Meyer, Wieseler, Rothe, Stier, and by a few English divines, Alford (on Matt. xiii. 55), T. W. Farrar (in W. Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. i., p. 231), and, though not decidedly, by Andrews (*Life of our Lord*, p. 114). This view of the case is the most natural, and would probably be taken by a majority of commentators, if it were not from the scruples arising from the long and widely cherished doctrine of the perpetual virginity of Mary. Once clearly and fully established on the testimony of Scripture and history, this theory would give a powerful polemical weapon into the

* In a remarkable fragment on the four Marys (ap. ROUTH, *Reliquiæ sacræ* ex Cod. MSS. 2397): "I. *Maria*, mater Domini. II. *Maria*, CLEOPHÆ SIVE ALPHÆI uxor, quæ fuit *mater Jacobi Episcopi et Apostoli, et Simonis, et Thadéi* [Judæ Jacobi], et cujusdam *Joseph*. III. *Maria* Salome, uxor Zebedei, mater Joannis evangelistæ et Jacobi. IV. *Maria* Magdalena." But Papias omits one, *Mary* of Bethany, and is well known to have been somewhat weakminded, superstitious, and confused; although in a mere matter of fact his testimony may nevertheless be very valuable.

† Calvin for instance regards the question as one of idle curiosity *in Matt.* i. 25: "*Certe nemo unquam hac de re questionem movebit nisi curiosus; nemo vero pertinaciter insistet nisi contentiosus rixator.*"

‡ This explanation was brought out first clearly by Wieseler (in the *Studien und Kritiken* for 1840, p. 648 sqq.), and adopted by Meyer, Lange, and Alford. But the old Syriac version already implied this interpretation by inserting a *καί* before Μαρία, and translating: "And there were standing near the cross of Jesus, His mother, and His mother's sister [Salome], *and* Mary of Cleophas, and Mary Magdalene."

* Hegesippus, in Eusebius' H. E. iii. 11, comp. iv. 22, asserts, that Clopas was the brother of Joseph, but it does not appear whether he uses the term brother strictly, or for brother-in-law.

hands of Protestants, and destroy by one fatal blow one of the strongest pillars of Romish Mariology and Mariolatry, and the ascetic overestimate of the state of celibacy. But the case is by no means so clear at the present state of the controversy that we could avail ourselves of this advantage; and Protestants themselves, as already remarked, differ in their views, or feelings, or tastes, concerning the perpetual virginity of Mary.

(*b*) The brothers of Jesus were *older sons of Joseph* from a *former* marriage, and thus in the eyes of the law and before the world, though not by blood, brothers and sisters of Christ. This view has the doctrinal advantage of leaving the perpetual virginity of Mary untouched. It seems, moreover, to have been the oldest, and was held not only among the Ebionites, and in the pseudo-apostolical constitution, but by several early fathers, as Origen, Eusebius (who calls James of Jerusalem a "son of Joseph," but nowhere of Mary), Gregory of Nyssa, Cyril of Alexandria, Epiphanius (who even mentions the supposed order of birth of the four sons and two daughters), Hilary, Ambrose, etc.* It is equally consistent with the Scripture data on the subject as the other alternative, and in some respects even more so. For it agrees better with the apparent difference of age between Joseph (who early disappears in the gospel history) and Mary, and especially with the patronizing and presumptuous air of the brothers of Christ, when they sought an interview with Him at a particular crisis (Matt. xii. 46), and when they boldly dared to suggest to Him a more expeditious and ostentatious Messianic policy (John vii. 3–10). This is at least more readily explained, if they were older according to the flesh; while on the other theory some of them must have been almost too young to figure so prominently in the gospel history. It is true, they are nowhere called *sons of Joseph*;† but neither are they called *sons of Mary*. The reason in both cases must be found in the fact, that Christ is the great central figure in the Gospels, round which all others move.—P. S.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. In this narrative the Evangelist sets before us the circumstances under which the sufferings of our High Priest were introduced—by successive rejections of His person and claims. This in all probability induced him to relate in this connection that Christ was rejected even in His own city. But the historian drops a veil over the particulars and circumstances of His rejection. Nazareth adjoined Matthew's native city, and, perhaps, lay even within the district of his home.

2. On the fact that our Lord had no uterine brothers or sisters, comp. my *Leben Jesu*, ii. 1, p. 139 sqq. To our mind, there seems nothing offensive in the idea, that Joseph and Mary lived on conjugal terms;‡ but it appears to us inconceivable that the mother of Jesus should afterward have given birth to other children. Besides, the brothers of the Lord are introduced as speaking and acting like persons who claim to have more enlarged experience than Jesus, or, as we infer, as His seniors.

* *See* the quotations in my book on James, p. 80 sqq. Chrysostom may also be included in this class; at least he clearly separates the brothers of Christ from the apostles, for the reason that they were for a long time unbelievers (Hom. v. in Matt.).

† Eusebius, however, H. E. ii. 1, calls James of Jerusalem a "son of Joseph."

‡ [In this point Lange differs from the view of the Greek and Latin Churches, which deny every conjugal intercourse as degrading the character of the holy Virgin, and inconsistent with her perpetua Virginitas.—P. S.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The question: "*Is not this the carpenter's son?*" or prejudice.—How the people of Nazareth condemned themselves, while imagining that they judged Jesus.—How they unconsciously verified the exclamation of Nathanael: "Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?"—How every prejudice against Christianity contains the germ of its own condemnation. For, 1. it evidences a want of proper faith, (*a*) in the power of God, (*b*) in humanity, (*c*) in the miracles of history, (*d*) in the deeper recesses of our own inner life; 2. and yet even prejudice must confess that the wisdom and the works of Christ are most mysterious and inexplicable. Hence such persons readily have recourse to lying and hostile criticisms.—The offence of the people of Nazareth on account of the humble origin of the Lord, a picture of all other offences in Him. 1. An offence, (*a*) in His terrestrial state and existence; (*b*) in His human lowliness; (*c*) in His brothers and sisters with their human weaknesses. 2. Yet an offence which will leave us self-condemned, since it implies an admission of His wisdom and of His deeds. 3. A most fatal offence, since unbelief deprives us of the blessings of Christ's wondrous works.—The saying of Christ, "*A prophet is not without honor, save in his own country, and in his own house:*" 1. As an extenuation; 2. as a reproof.—Jesus rejected by His own city.—The rejection of Jesus in Nazareth a prelude to His rejection by the people.—Nazareth, so poor, yet casting out the Lord of glory: 1. Nazareth in Galilee; 2. the land of Judea so poor; 3. the earth so poor.—The inmost characteristic of unbelief is, that it implies contempt of our own being and higher nature.—Whenever we read that the Lord "*could not do*," or else that He "*knew not*," the circumstances connected with it show that it was not from weakness or ignorance, but that His infinite power and wisdom were controlled and limited by supreme love and faithfulness.—How the King gradually merged into the High Priest.

[*Matt. Henry*:—Ver. 58. Unbelief is the great obstruction to Christ's favor.—If mighty works are not wrought in us, it is not for want of power or grace in Christ, but for want of faith in us.—P. S.]

Starke:—*Canstein*: Jesus is in truth the son of the carpenter; but of that Carpenter who made heaven and earth.—Ungrounded prejudices are too often obstacles in the way of faith, John vii. 40–42.—*Jerome*: *Naturale propemodum est cives civibus invidere.—Homines familiaria contemnere, peregrina exosculari et in admiratione ac pretio habere solent.**

Gerlach:—Carnal men look at the outward appearance; and this state of mind repels them from the Son of God, appearing in the form of a servant.

Heubner:—Jesus does not force His love or His blessings upon us.—Pride brings its own punishment. (Of this, history furnishes ample confirmation.)

* [Comp. the proverbs: "Familiarity breeds contempt;" "Distance lends enchantment to the view;" "*Es ist nicht weit her*" (It is not far off).—P. S.]

B. CHRIST MANIFESTS HIMSELF AS THE HIGH PRIEST IN HIS SUFFERINGS; BEING REJECTED BY THE POLITICAL DESPOTISM OF HEROD, THE RULER OF GALILEE.

CHAPTER XIV. 1-33 (Mark vi. 14-56; Luke ix. 7-17; John vi. 1-21).

CONTENTS:—Jesus withdraws Himself from the court of Herod Antipas, who had just murdered John the Baptist. The priestly realm of the Lord in the desert among the poor people; or, the first miraculous feeding of the multitude. Priestly sway of the Lord amid the terrors of the night at sea.

---

1. *Retirement of the Lord from the vicinity of Herod.* CH. XIV. 1-13.

1, 2 At that time Herod the tetrarch heard of the fame of Jesus, And said unto his ser-
vants, This is John the Baptist; he is risen from the dead; and therefore mighty works
3 do shew forth themselves in him.[1] For Herod had laid hold on John, and bound him,
and put *him* [out of the way][2] in prison for Herodias' sake,[3] his brother Philip's[4]
4, 5 wife. For John said unto him, It is not lawful for thee to have her. And when he
would have put him to death, he feared[5] the multitude, because they counted [held]
6 him as a prophet. But when Herod's birthday was kept,[6] the daughter of Herodias
7 danced before them, and pleased Herod. Whereupon he promised with an oath to
8 give her whatsoever she would [should] ask. And she, being before instructed of [led
on by][7] her mother, said, Give me here John Baptist's head in a charger [platter].[8]
9 And the king was sorry:[9] nevertheless [but] for the oath's sake, and them which sat
10 [that reclined] with him at meat, he commanded *it* to be given *her*. And he sent, and
11 beheaded John in the prison. And his head was brought in a charger [platter], and
12 given to the damsel: and she brought *it* to her mother. And his disciples came, and
took up the body,[10] and buried it, and went and told Jesus.
13 When Jesus heard *of it*, he departed [withdrew from, ἀνεχώρησεν] thence by ship
into a desert place apart: and when the people had heard *thereof*, they followed him on
foot out of the cities.

[1] Ver. 2.—[Αἱ δυνάμεις ἐνεργοῦσιν ἐν αὐτῷ; Lange: *darum walten die Wunderkräfte in ihm;* Ewald: *desswegen wirken die Heilmächte in ihm;* J. Wesley: *Therefore these mighty powers exert themselves in him;* Green (Gram. of the N. T., p. 151): *The Spiritual Powers are active in him;* Conant and the revised N. T. of the Am. Bible Union: *therefore do these powers work in him.*—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 3.—Lachmann: ἀπέθετο, after Cod. B. So also Origen twice. [Cod. Sinait. sustains the more expressive reading ἐν φυλακῇ ἀπέθετο instead of ἔθετο ἐν φυλ.—P. S.]

[3] Ver. 3.—[Conant and the N. T. of the A. B. U. more smoothly: *for the sake of Herodias.*—P. S.]

[4] Ver. 3.—Φιλίππου is wanting in Cod. D., Vulg., etc. Meyer regards it as an insertion from Mark.

[5] Ver. 5.—[Lange: *er war willens* (*geneigt*) *ihn zu tödten, fürchtete sich aber*, etc. Conant and the N. T. of the A. B. U.: *and he desired* (θέλων) *to put him to death, but feared* (ἐφοβήθη).—P. S.]

[6] Ver. 6.—Lachmann, Tischendorf: γενεσίοις δὲ γενομένοις, after B., D., Z. [Cod. Sinait. sustains this reading for the received reading: γενεσίων δὲ ἀγομένων.—P. S.]

[7] Ver. 8.—[Lange translates προβιβασθεῖσα: *bearbeitet* von; Luther: *zugerichtet;* de Wette: *bewogen;* Stier: *angestiftet;* Meyer: *gefördert, dazu gebracht;* Ewald still stronger: *aufgestachelt.* Conant: "The verb προβιβάζειν means *to lead forward; to lead on*, the only use of πρό in this compound. The error of the English vernacular Bible originated in the Vulgate rendering *præmonita.* Margin of the Bishops' Bible: '*Or* enticed, *or* induced.'" —P. S.]

[8] Ver. 8.—[Tyndale, Coverdale, Cranmer, Genevan, and the Bishops' Bible, all correctly render ἐπὶ πίνακι: *in a platter* (a large, shallow dish), for which the translators of King James substituted: *in a charger*, which also means a large dish, but now more commonly a horse used in battle. Wiclif and the Rheims Vers. have: *in a dish*, the Lat. Vulg.: *in disco.*—P. S.]

[9] Ver. 9.—The reading: ἐλυπήθη is not quite sure. Lachmann and Tischendorf [also Tregelles and Alford] read with B., D., etc.: λυπηθείς. [But this does not affect the sense, nor the English rendering.—P. S.]

[10] Ver. 12.—Lachmann, after the oldest authorities, reads: πτῶμα. [Cod. Sinait. sustains πτῶμα, *corpse*, against the usual σῶμα, *body.*—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Chronological Arrangement.—The offence which Christ had experienced in His own *city* is followed by another offence on the part of His *sovereign.* This may have been another practical reason why Matthew records in this connection what had taken place on a former occasion. The chronological succession of events appears from John vi. 1. After the return of Jesus from the festival of Purim, He passed over the Sea of Galilee, as it would seem near Tiberias. Evidently the feeding of the multitude, here recorded, was the first occasion of that kind; the circumstances are the same as in John—five loaves, two

fishes, five thousand people, twelve baskets full of fragments;—the narrative being followed in both Gospels by an account of Christ's walking on the sea. On the other hand, Luke reports the return of the Apostles (Luke ix. 10), after having recorded that Herod had wished to see Jesus. Christ, however, withdraws with His disciples into the wilderness near Bethsaida (on the other side of the lake). There the miraculous feeding of the multitude took place. Mark records in the same manner and connection the motive for His passage across the sea, as also His feeding the multitude and walking on the waters. From all this we conclude that this event took place at the time when Jesus again met His disciples in Galilee, on His return from the visit to Jerusalem, which closed with His last missionary journey through Galilee. On the other hand, Matthew, xi. 12, 13, represents the Saviour as again going about with His disciples.

Ver. 1. **Herod Antipas** (Ἀντίπας = Ἀντίπατρος), the son of Herod the Great and of Malthace, a Samaritan. In his testament, Herod had appointed him tetrarch of Galilee and Peræa. Antipas entered into a secret contract of marriage with Herodias, the daughter of Aristobulus, his half-brother, and the wife of another half-brother, Herod Philippus; and in consequence repudiated his lawful wife, the daughter of Aretas, king of Arabia. Aretas declared war and conquered Herod; but was prevented by the Romans from following up his victory. From motives of ambition, Herodias persuaded her weak and indolent husband to repair to Rome, after the accession of Caligula, in order to secure for himself the title of king, which had been previously obtained by Herod Agrippa, the nephew of Antipater (Jos. *Antiq.* 18, 7, 1). But, on the accusation of Agrippa, Antipater was deposed by the emperor, and banished to Lyons, where Herodias, his wife, followed him. He died in Spain, whither probably he was afterward transported. From the first, Herod was a light-minded, unreliable, prodigal, and luxurious prince; hence also he proved superstitious and cunning (Luke xiii. 32; Mark viii. 15), and on certain occasions, either from folly or weakness, utterly heartless, cruel, and callous (*see* the history of the Passion). Jewish tradition likewise represents him in an unfavorable light. Herod Philippus, the son of a high priest's daughter, was disinherited by his father, and lived as a private citizen. He must not be confounded with Philip the tetrarch. According to Jerome (*Contra Rufin.* iii. 42), Herodias vented her fury even against the dead body of John the Baptist. The daughter of Herodias here spoken of was by the first marriage; her name was Salome (Jos. *Antiq.* 18, 5, 4).—On the title τετράρχης, comp. Bretschneider, *Lexicon*. The term *tetrarch*, or ruler over a fourth part of the country, is here used in a general sense, and as equivalent to *ethnarch*. Properly speaking, Herod was a *triarch*. *See* ch. ii.

At that time.—The sovereign over the country of Jesus seems now to have heard of Him for the first time. Grotius suggests that Antipater had only returned from Rome; Baronius, that he had been engaged in war with Aretas. In our view of the matter, the tetrarch had been wholly absorbed by the pleasures and the follies of his court, until, as his conscience became aroused, he began to bestow more attention upon such events and tidings. However, it is probable that at the time when Jesus went through the various cities along the Sea of Galilee, Antipater had resided at Machærus, which was at some distance from the scene of the Saviour's preaching.

Ver. 2. **Unto his servants,**—or slaves, viz., his courtiers. An Oriental mode of expression.

This is John the Baptist.—It has sometimes been argued that Herod was a Sadducee, partly on the ground of a mistaken combination of Mark viii. 15 with Matt. xvi. 6 (the expression in the one passage being, "the leaven of Herod," in the other, "the leaven of the Sadducees"), and partly from the notion, now exploded, that the Sadducees were immoral libertines. But then the difficulty naturally arose, how he could in that case have believed in the resurrection of the dead. Wetstein suggests that an evil conscience had awakened in his breast doubts and fears on this subject; while Meyer infers from the passage that he had not been a Sadducee. Still more unsatisfactory is the explanation offered by Grotius, and others, that Herod had referred to the *transmigration* of souls, as the monarch distinctly speaks of the resurrection of John. The Jews never seriously entertained such a doctrine, although it has sometimes been imputed to the Pharisees. In our opinion, Herod was neither a Pharisee nor a Sadducee by conviction, although he was identified with the latter party, chiefly, perhaps, from tendencies shared by the whole of his family. In this view of the case, it is quite conceivable that he should have spoken under the influence of a conscience roused and quickened by superstitious fears, and that all the more readily, that the people generally, and even the courtiers of Herod, seem at that time to have been speculating upon, and discussing the character and mission of Jesus. The rejection of the Pharisees must to a certain extent have counteracted the public testimony borne to Jesus. Hence some said that He was Elijah; others, that He was one of the old prophets, perhaps Jeremiah; while some broached the idea, that in Him John the Baptist was risen from the dead (Luke ix. 7). We may readily suppose that, in the circumstances, some of the flatterers at court, in their desire to quiet the fears of their prince, may have caught at this. Suffice it, Herod immediately took it up. It might serve various purposes. At any rate, it implied a kind of denial of the Messiahship of Jesus; besides, it would diminish his guilt, accord with his superstitious disposition, flatter his theological ambition (remember Henry VIII.), and serve as apology for his desire to see Jesus, which to some might appear suspicious. Nay, he may even have given expression to these views in a semi-hypocritical manner, as "a fox," Luke xiii. 32. At all events, a theological curiosity like that of Herod, and such motives, could only repel the Lord Jesus.

Ver. 4. **It is not lawful,** Lev. xviii. 16; xx. 21.—Josephus adds, that besides this motive for imprisoning John, Herod was also afraid lest John should excite a popular tumult (*Antiq.* 18, 5, 2). But this apprehension must have originated in the Baptist's denunciations of his adultery.

Ver. 6. **Herod's birth-day.**—The anniversary of his accession to the throne, his *kingly* birth; Ps. ii. 7; 1 Sam. xiii. 1. Suicer, *Thesaurus*, i. p. 746; Wieseler, 293.*—The *dativ. abs.* [according to the true reading] is probably intended to indicate that the feast was nearing its close; hence that the guests were intoxicated, and that the excitement of the

* [The word γενέσια may just as well be taken in the usual sense, *birthday*, as is done by Meyer. *See* his references *in loc.*—P. S.]

scene offered the most favorable opportunity for accomplishing the satanic purpose of Herodias.

Danced before them.—The dance of Salome was, "without doubt, mimic, and probably voluptuous. Hor. *Od.* 3, 6, 21." [Meyer.] The poor girl was on the mother's side a grandchild of Mariamne, the *Asmonean* princess. Her dancing was a crime not only against the Baptist, but also against Philip her own father. To engage in a profane dance, and that, as the text has it, ἐν τῷ μέσῳ—in the midst, referring probably not merely to the banqueting-hall, but to the circle of spectators which formed around her—was to forget even the decency and decorum of a Jewish maid.

Ver. 8. **But she being prepared** (*wrought upon, led on*) **by her mother.**—Meyer: "προβιβασθεῖσα, induced, instigated, not instructed." But the verb includes the idea of instructing along with that of training and determining. In the present instance, not merely was moral resistance overcome, but, evidently, cunning and detailed instructions had been given. Every one of the expressions used by her points to the determination of taking Herod by surprise.

Ver. 9. **And the king was sorry.**—This is not incompatible with ver. 5. Herodias had on former occasions sought to kill the Baptist. (Lachmann, following Cod. C. and others, reads ἐζήτει in Mark vi. 19.) But Herod (influenced by her) was merely willing, or inclined toward it (θέλων; the word θέλειν is frequently applied to inclination, where as yet there is no decision). Two opposite motives kept him in a state of indecision. On the one hand, he was urged on by the rancor of Herodias; while, on the other, he was kept back by fear of the people. Nor was his sorrow merely caused by a sudden call of conscience; he was startled by this terrible demand, made in so daring and ghastly a manner, which awakened him all at once from intoxication to full consciousness of the important political consequences of this act.

For the sake of the oath.—An instance of sinful performance of an oath (Meyer). But the remark about **them that reclined with him at table** is significant. Two elements besides his oath seem to have determined him—his princely honor, and the hatred of the court to the Baptist. In all this fashionable throng, no angel's voice was heard on behalf of John.

Ver. 11. **And his head was brought in a platter.** — The narrative seems to imply that the head of the Baptist was brought while the feast still lasted. This circumstance, however, suggests the place where the banquet was held. If Herod had been at Tiberias, his usual residence, the messengers would have required two days to execute their commission. Fritzsche assumes that Herod was at the time actually at Tiberias, and concludes that the narrative must be incorrect in this particular. Following the opinion of Maldonatus, Grotius, and others, Meyer holds that the feast had taken place in Machærus itself. According to Hug and Wieseler, it was celebrated at Julias or Livias, another place of residence of Antipas, situate not far from Machærus, in the mountains on the eastern side of the Dead Sea. This view seems to us to have most in its favor. Not only was there a royal palace at Livias, but the narrative, more especially in Mark, conveys the impression that the messengers of Herod were despatched to some distance.

Ver. 12. **And went and told Jesus.**—An evidence that the faith of the Baptist had been entirely re-established by his embassy to Jesus, and that it had also served to attach the disciples of John to the person of the Saviour—a bond further strengthened by the death of their master. However, some of John's disciples may have taken offence when Christ still persevered in His course of endurance and submission; and this may have driven them into the antagonism which afterward issued in the formation of a separate sect. The execution of the Baptist took place shortly before Easter, in the year 782 (John vi. 4). When in the summer of the year 781 Jesus returned from Judea to Galilee, John was at Ænon, near Salim, in the midst of his ministerial activity. But when, toward the month of Adar (about March) of the year 782, Christ journeyed to Jerusalem to attend the festival of Purim, John had been already for some time confined to prison. Accordingly, we infer that his imprisonment must have taken place during the autumn of the year 781, and that he was confined for fully half a year. Thus his active life was somewhat shorter than that of the Lord. While the operations of Christ gradually extended from Galilee to Judea, the reverse was the case with those of the Baptist. Commencing his work in the wilderness of Judah, he gradually passed through the lower valley of the Jordan to Salim and Ænon, John iii. 23, and lastly to the court of Herod. And as the Lord met death at Jerusalem, so His forerunner at the court of the ruler of Galilee.

Ver. 13. **When Jesus heard of this.**—Referring in the first instance to the tidings brought by the disciples of John. Besides, we must not overlook, as an additional motive for Christ's departure, the impression produced by these tidings upon the disciples. No doubt the Apostles, as well as the disciples of John, were deeply moved by the news of the Baptist's execution. The enthusiasm with which they had returned from their first mission had in great measure given place to depression. This seems to be implied in the language of Mark: "Come ye yourselves apart, and rest a while." Luke conveys the impression that Antipas was taking measures to bring about an interview with Jesus. This determined Christ immediately to leave the place where He then was—probably Tiberias, whither Antipas may in the interval have returned. The motives of the Saviour were, moral abhorrence and distrust of Herod, and the necessity of restoring the disciples to a right state of feeling—the more so, that Judas was in his heart already forsaking the cause of the gospel. On the eastern shore of the lake, and in the wilderness, He and they were safe under the mild sway of Philip, the only one of Herod's sons who deserved the name of a good prince. (*See* the article in the Encyclops.)

Into a desert place apart.—According to Luke ix. 10, in Gaulonitis, near the *eastern* Bethsaida. In the dominions of Philip, Jesus found a safe retreat, where His followers might recover their tone of mind, and prepare for going forth anew.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. On three different occasions was the Lord repelled by the duplicity and utter want of all character in Herod. On the occasion just considered, this prince was anxious for an interview, partly from political motives, and partly from superstitious curiosity, in the hope of thereby assuaging the voice of conscience. Again, shortly before the Saviour for

the last time left Galilee, Herod conveyed to Him by a third party a threat, for the purpose of inducing Him immediately to quit his territory (Luke xiii. 31). Lastly, on the day of Christ's final sufferings we mark the same bold and carnal intrusiveness, inducing him to ask for signs and miracles—demands which the Saviour met with unbroken silence, Luke xxiii. 8. Thus Antipas may be designated as the representative of that class with whom the Saviour enters upon no terms,—whom He avoids when they flatter, rebukes when they threaten, and at last punishes by complete silence. Again, we may learn from the case of Antipas, the sad upshot of a *disposition to be interested in, and patronizingly to condescend to, the gospel*, which characterizes the relation of so many superstitious worldlings toward that which is holy.

2. Herod seems to have been inclined to bestow on the Lord the vacant place of honor formerly occupied by John at his court (comp. Mark vi. 20). But Christ treats the execution of the prophet as aimed against Himself. And so it really was. After all, every true martyrdom is the martyrdom of Christ in the world.

3. Besides the two elements already adverted to —the Lord's independence of all worldly pomp and His wisdom—we may also notice in this history both the faithfulness of John's disciples, and the earnestness of the poor people who followed Him on foot out of all their cities.

4. It is a strange fact that the marriage offences in the families of princes during the Middle Ages appear to have been partly an heir-loom of the Crusades, and thus to point back to the Arabs and to Hagar. The Idumeans were a race kindred to the Arabs. The history of the family of Herod is full of such offences. Nor can we fail to perceive the increased importance attaching to such sins in the case of princes, though, in general, the family must ever be regarded as the root of the state.

5. The vows of Herod. Sinful vows must be repented of. *Gossner:* God would rather have us break *our* word than *His* word.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

How the great of this world stand affected toward the message concerning the works of Jesus: 1. It is late of reaching them; 2. it is ill understood; 3. it is wrongly interpreted.—Herod Antipas the figure of a weak despotism, as Herod the Great was of a strong tyranny. 1. Wherein they agree: In their contempt of men, selfishness, want of feeling, cunning, and affectation of intellectual and spiritual aspirations. 2. Wherein they differ: In the case of strong despots, pride and cruelty are foremost, and voluptuousness only secondary; while the reverse is the case with weak tyrants.—How a Herod seeks to appease his conscience: 1. By superstition; 2. by theological pretensions; 3. by an affectation of interest in spiritual achievements.—How superstition and the service of sin support and minister to each other.—Sketch of a demoralized court: 1. Hypocritical religiosity; 2. dissolute manners and marriage scandals; 3. a poor statecraft; 4. luxurious festivities; 5. bloody donations and payments.—Sad portraiture of the world and its pomp: 1. Its religion and its theology; 2. its pretended liberty and its love: 3. its works and its feasts; 4. its interest in the Beautiful and its art; 5. its oaths and its scrupulous honor.—Bloody marriages connected with the history of martyrs (Ahab, Herod, etc.*).—The feast of Herod viewed in the light of his reign.—The festivities of worldliness.—The character of Herod.—Herodias.—The courtiers.—The flattery and deceit of the fashionable world.—How the tempter watches for the moment of our intoxication.—Cordial agreement between the wicked both at the beheading of John and at the crucifixion of Christ.—The sorrow of Herod, and the fear of Pilate.—How they both thought themselves excused.—Salome; or, awful lessons given by a mother.—Art in the service of sin.—The oath of Herod; or, how he wishes to be conscientious in his own way.—The courage and faithfulness of John the Baptist.—Becoming, modest, and yet firm and faithful manner, in which the Baptist reproved the sin of Herod.—Faithful unto the end.—Different estimate attaching to the blood of prophets: 1. In the sight of the wicked, and of their blind instruments; 2. of vain people; 3. of faithful disciples; 4. of the Lord Himself.—Bloody presents of tyrants and of enemies of the truth.—How the sufferings of the saints often serve to efface both their disappointments and their weaknesses.—How the Lord applied as to Himself the death of John.—How in reality it was Christ's death which was encompassed.—Christ suffering in His martyrs.—How moral abhorrence drives the Lord across the wide sea, and far into the wilderness.—Conduct of Jesus toward Antipas.—The decease of John a prelude to that of Christ.—Comparison between the end of John and that of Christ: 1. The one long confined, the other suddenly carried away; 2. in the one case the secrecy of the prison; in the other, the concourse of the people at Golgotha; 3. the one beheaded, the other crucified, etc.—Blessing of good princes in whose territories believers have often found a refuge.—Safe retreats which the Lord in ancient and in modern times has prepared for His own.—The servants of the Lord recovering themselves in retirement.

Starke:—Courts are generally the paradise of foxes and of flatterers.—*Hedinger:* Many an honest man has paid with his fortune and success, if not with his life, for the dancing, the flattery, or the calumnies of a harlot.—A sedate and devout Christian leaves dancing to goats, calves, and children, and orders his steps according to the word of God, and not the directions of the dancing-master.—Incest, adultery, and unlawful divorce, were combined in this instance.—*Hedinger:* Persecution, reproach, and death are like daily bread to faithful preachers.—Great lords may issue their injunctions, but they cannot annul one of God's commandments.—The servants of the Lord must bear testimony to the truth, whatever may befall them in consequence.—*J. Hall:* Courage and impartiality—two very necessary qualities in a preacher.—*Zeisius:* There is nothing in which courts are more deficient than in preachers of

* [Remember also the fearful night of St. Bartholomew, Aug. 24, 1572, and the massacre of the Huguenots in Paris, after the marriage of Henry of Navarre with the sister of the king of France, to which all the leaders of the French Protestants had been treacherously invited, to be most cruelly murdered. Pope Gregory XIII., on hearing the news of the destruction of twenty or thirty thousand Protestants in one night, and the probable destruction of heresy in France, caused a *Te deum* to be sung in the churches of Rome, and a medal to be struck in commemoration of this infernal tragedy. This approbation is one of the foulest deeds of popery and one of the darkest spots on the pages of its history, deplored and condemned even by many Catholics. Comp. WACHLER: *Die Bluthochzeit*, Leip., 1828, and the respective sections in the Histories of the French Reformation.—P. S.]

the truth.—*Osiander:* The noble and the mighty too frequently imagine that they are at liberty to do anything they please, just as if there were no God in heaven.—What folly to be afraid of man and of the devil, and not to fear God!—In the godless, one affection often restrains another; so that it is nature, not grace, which restrains them from many a sin.—A thoughtless oath.—Contradiction: To swear by the name of God in the midst of sinful festivities.—Thoughtless and daring promises.—Curse of parents who encourage their children to sin.—*Canstein:* There is nothing so bad or so devilish which an adulterous and shameless woman would not undertake and perform, Prov. xxiii. 27, 28.—It is the way of the wicked to prefer their own honor to that of God.—*Hall:* It is more difficult to arrest sin in its progress than to avoid its commencement.—*Zeisius:* The death of God's people is precious in His sight, however grievous the torments which men may inflict on them.—Abel the first just one under the Old, John under the New, Testament.—The birthday of Herod to full shame, that of John to full glory.—*Majus:* In general, harlots are not afraid of shedding blood, and often murder their own children.—*Osiander:* The splendid banquets of the wicked have often a very sorrowful termination.—True disciples and hearers will reverence a faithful teacher even after his death.—*Zeisius:* Let the bodies of the saints be honorably committed to the grave: they are the temples of the Holy Spirit.—*Quesnel:* Let us open our hearts to Christ.—It is an alleviation of our misery to be able to communicate it to friends.—It is an act of friendship to warn another of his danger.

Heubner:—Anecdotes on the connection between unbelief and superstition; instances of a bad conscience, of bold reproof from the pulpit, p. 205–207.—Courtiers have enough to do to discuss their worldly affairs. But when the kingdom of heaven spreads among the people, the great of this world take notice of it, if it were only on account of the political influence which it may exert.—Frequently, however, the world takes notice of what passes in the kingdom of heaven from hostility to it, or in order to mock.—The coarser unbelief, the nearer to superstition.—How did Herod come to think of John?—An uneasy conscience.—An evil conscience sees terrors everywhere.—*A Jezebel could not be wanting in the history of the second Elijah.*—Fear of the people often acts as a curb upon despotism.—The fear of God delivers from that of man.—Worldly festivities often become the occasion of iniquitous deeds.—Danger, when mothers try to show off their children.—Sinful promises can never be binding.—False ambition.—Tyrants are themselves under the most abject tyranny.—The head of a prophet a spectacle to gaze on. ("The body of Coligny was exposed during the massacre of St. Bartholomew, and his head sent to Rome.")

---

2. *The First Miraculous Feeding.* CH. XIV. 14–21.

14 And Jesus [he][1] went forth, and saw a great multitude, and was moved with com-
15 passion toward them, and he healed their sick. And when it was evening, his [the][2] dis-
ciples came to him, saying, This is a desert place, and the time [hour, ὥρα] is now past;
send the multitude away, that they may go into the villages, and buy themselves vic-
16 tuals. But Jesus said unto them, They need not depart; give ye them to eat.
17, 18 And they say unto him, We have here but five loaves, and two fishes. He said,
19 Bring them hither to me. And he commanded the multitude to sit down [recline, ἀνακλιθῆναι] on the grass, and took the five loaves, and the two fishes, and looking up
to heaven, he blessed, and brake, and gave the loaves to *his* [the] disciples, and the
20 disciples to the multitude. And they did all eat [all ate],[3] and were filled: and they
21 took up of the fragments that remained twelve [travelling-] baskets full. And they
that had eaten [ate][4] were about five thousand men, beside women and children.

[1] Ver. 14.—Ἰησοῦς is wanting in Codd. B., C., etc., as also in ver. 22 [and ver. 25]. Probably in both [all] cases inserted from the beginning of Scripture-lessons. [So Meyer. Cod. Sinait. likewise omits Ἰησοῦς in vers. 14, 22, and 25.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 15.—[The critical editions omit αὐτοῦ after οἱ μαθηταί. Lange, however, translates: "*seine* Jünger," and takes no notice of this difference of reading.—P. S.]

[3] Ver. 20.—[Ἔφαγον πάντες; lit.: *they all ate*. It is the simple past tense, while the C. Vers.: *did all eat*, is in modern English an emphatic expression, the auxiliary *did* implying a doubt or denial of the fact.—P. S.]

[4] Ver. 21.—[Lit.: *the persons eating*, οἱ δὲ ἐσθίοντες. The present participle means the time present, as usual, but with reference to a past act of numbering the persons fed.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 14. **And when He went forth,** ἐξελθών.—According to Matthew, Mark, and Luke, Christ had gone εἰς ἔρημον τόπον κατ' ἰδίαν; according to John, also εἰς τό ὄρος. He now went forth upon the ground covered by the multitudes who had followed Him; and, moved with compassion, His first occupation was again to heal their sick.

Ver. 15. **And when it was evening,** Ὀψίας δὲ γενομένης.—"This refers to the *first* evening, which lasted from the ninth to the twelfth hour of the day [according to the Jewish mode of counting from sunrise to sunset]; while ver. 23 refers to the *second* evening, which commenced at the twelfth hour

[at six o'clock P. M.]. *See* the word עֶרֶב in *Gesen. Lex.*" Meyer.

The hour is now past.—Fritzsche and Käuffer: *tempus opportunum, sc. disserendi et sanandi.*—De Wette, Meyer: The day-time. Why not more definitely, in view of what follows: the hour of the evening meal?—De Wette and Meyer have erroneously supposed that the account of this event, as recorded by John, where Jesus Himself is represented as introducing the question as to the bread, is incompatible with the narrative in the other gospels. But as John evidently intended to relate merely the fact of the miraculous feeding, we must not press his words as if he meant that the Saviour had put this question when first beholding the people. According to the account in John, it was a lad who had the five loaves and the two fishes.

Ver. 18. **To recline on the grass.**—In Palestine, spring commences in the middle of February. If, therefore, the festival of Purim occurred that year on the 19th of March, the miraculous feeding must have taken place in the second half of March, or during the middle of spring in the holy land.

[Green grass (ἐπὶ τῷ χλορῷ χόρτῳ, as Mark vi. 39 has it), or pasture, which, according to John vi. 10, abounded in that region, was a delightful resting-place at that season of the year in Palestine. Mark adds a graphic touch concerning the manner in which the Saviour commanded the multitude to recline on the pasture ground, viz., **in ranks** (better, **by parties**, or **in groups**, Greek: πρασιαί, πρασιαί = *areolatim*, in square garden plots), **by hundreds, and by fifties** (vi. 40; comp. Luke ix. 14: "*by fifties, in a company*"). They probably formed two semicircles, an outer semicircle of thirty hundreds, and an inner semicircle of forty fifties. This was a wise, symmetrical arrangement, which avoided all confusion, and facilitated an easy and just distribution of the food among all classes by the disciples.—P. S.]

Ver. 19. **He took the five loaves.**—Baked according to Jewish fashion; bread-cakes, in the shape of a plate.

He blessed.—Literally, *He gave praise*, εὐλόγησε. John expresses it: εὐχαριστήσας. Luke uses the terms εὐλόγησεν αὐτούς, indicating the consecration of the bread, as in the Eucharist, 1 Cor. x. 16. "According to Jewish custom, at the commencement of every meal the head of the house gave thanks while he broke bread. This prayer was called 'a blessing.'" According to Mark, the disciples distributed the bread among the people, who were arranged in groups, Mark vi. 40.

Ver. 20. **Of the fragments.**—Broken pieces,* not crumbs. [Olshausen: With the God of nature, as with nature herself, the most prodigal bounty goes hand in hand with the nicest and exactest economy. This notice of the Evangelist is an additional mark of the truthfulness of the narrative, and the divine character of the miracle. The gathering of the fragments was also for the purpose of impressing the miracle more vividly on the memory, and perpetuating its effect, as well as for teaching a lesson of economy.—P. S.]

Twelve travelling-baskets full, κόφινοι.—The number twelve seems to refer to that of the Apostles, although it by no means implies that the baskets belonged to them. The Apostles gathered these fragments, when each brought his basket full. At the second miraculous feeding, the seven baskets are called σπυρίδες, the term employed for the round plaited baskets commonly used for bread and for fishes. De Wette: "The narrative clearly conveys the fact, that more fragments were left than would have constituted the five loaves. Paulus [the rationalist] attempts to paraphrase the language of the text: '*they took there* twelve baskets full.' Of course, that would destroy the miraculous character of the event. But this clumsy device may now be regarded as only a historical curiosity."

Ver. 21. **And they that had eaten.**—As the feast of Passover was at hand, the people had already collected in larger numbers.

General Remarks. 1. *On the relation of this miracle to the other miraculous feeding* related in ch. xv. 32.—The critical conjecture of Schleiermacher, Strauss, and others, that the first and the second miraculous feeding were, in reality, two different and incorrect narratives of one and the same event, is evidently untenable. Irrespective of the confusion which is presumed to exist in the account of the Evangelists, even a slight consideration of the differences in point of time and circumstances will convince us of its groundlessness. The provision, the number of the people, and the fragments left on each occasion, were entirely dissimilar. Besides, in the first instance, the miracle was wrought on the evening of the first day; in the second, after the people had remained for three days with the Saviour. Lastly, there is an equal difference between the events which preceded and succeeded each of these miracles. In the one instance, Jesus had passed over from the western shore, and the feeding of the multitude was succeeded by His walking on the sea. In the other instance, Jesus had arrived at the eastern shore, after His journey through the Phœnician territory, and the district around the sources of the Jordan, while the miracle was succeeded by His last conflict with the Pharisees and Sadducees of Galilee. Again, the people which were fed on each occasion were, as might readily be supposed, those who had just listened to his teaching, and who followed Him from the places which He had visited. Accordingly, on the first occasion they were chiefly gathered from the cities along the western shore of the lake; while, on the second, they assembled from the mountains on the eastern side. Lastly, as the place where the miracle took place was different, so the time also,—the first occurring in spring, and the second a considerable time after Easter, or in summer.

2. *The miracle itself.*—Different theories on the subject have been current. 1. It has been attempted to explain it away: (*a*) By *exegetical devices*, or attempts to represent it as a natural event. Thus Paulus suggests that those who sat down at this meal were induced by the example of Christ to give up their provisions, etc. Similarly, Gfrörer, Ammon, etc. (*b*) *On the mythical theory;* it being supposed that it was an imitation of Old Testament models (Ex. xvi.; 1 Kings xvii. 8–16; 2 Kings iv. 1, 42), with the view of meeting the popular notions concerning the Messiah (Strauss).* (*c*) By viewing it *symbolic-*

* [Κλάσματα from κλάω, *to break*, as *fragments* from *frango*, *Bruchstücke* from *brechen*.—P. S.]

* [In his new and more popular work on the *Life of Jesus*, which has just appeared (Leipzig, 1864, p. 496 sqq.), Strauss takes the same mythical view of this miracle, as in his larger work, and states that the account of the evangelists contains no feature which may not be satisfactorily explained from the Mosaic-prophetic precedent of the twofold miraculous feeding of Israel in the wilderness (Exod. xvi.

*ally.** This may be characterized as a combination of the theory of Paulus with the mythico-poetical theory of Strauss. It is supposed that, with special reference to certain analogous passages, a natural event had assumed in the mind of the Church a symbolical bearing; the truth thus conveyed being simply, that Jesus had broken the bread of life, or the bread of Christian fellowship (de Wette). (*d*) By regarding it as a *parable* (*i. e.*, as mythical only so far as its form is concerned); the narrative being supposed to have arisen from what was originally intended as a parable (Weisse).—2. The miracle has been fully admitted, but it has been viewed,—(*a*) as an abstract miracle, or simply as the result of omnipotence, no attempt being made to account for it either in a mental or moral sense; nay, these intermediate links of connection being intentionally ignored or denied. (*b*) An attempt has been made to account for the manner in which the miracle was brought about by what Olshausen calls a *quickening and accelerating of the natural process*—an explanation which we frankly confess our inability to understand.† (*c*) Christ effected the increase of the provision τῷ λόγῳ καὶ τῇ εὐλογίᾳ (Origen, Meyer). Everybody admits this; but the difficulty is, what we are to understand by the expression εὐλόγησεν αὐτούς in Luke. (*d*) We regard it *as a concrete and moral manifestation of the miraculous power of Christ*. This miraculous feeding may be viewed as a parallel to the miraculous production of wine at the marriage in Cana, and both as foreshadowing the Eucharist. In His capacity as glorified Redeemer, Christ is here working and acting upon His creatures, quickening, so to speak, and infinitely enlarging the qualities inherent in bread; while, at the same time, He awakens a corresponding disposition in those who sit down to partake of the meal. It is a heavenly meal where hearts and minds as well as bodies are fed, and where the inner man is not dead, or standing without, like a beggar, but where, *for the time*, all are treated as members of Jesus in the house of the Lord. Viewed in this light, the increase of quantity is just the blessing of God the Son, as Creator of the kingdom of bliss and of love. This explanation, we venture to say, has not yet been sufficiently understood and appreciated. However, it must not be regarded as implying that the result produced was merely moral and religious. As in the production of the wine, power went forth from the Logos, by which earthly water was converted into heavenly wine—real wine, though not of earthly vintage; so, in the present case also, power went out from Him which increased the natural quality of the bread—enlarged it —just as, to some extent, the leaven does. Even the operation of leaven shows that bread is thus capable of having its powers increased.* Something of this kind seems to have been present to the mind of Olshausen, who also aptly remarks, that "throughout the gospel history we never read of any purely creative work on the part of the Saviour. Just as nature forms a new creation from the seed, so Christ transforms water into wine, or increases the five loaves; but without some substratum He creates neither wine nor bread."† In thinking of similar miracles under the Old Testament, we specially recall to mind the provision of manna and of quails; while we regard as a parallel case what is recorded of Elijah in 1 Kings xix. 8: "And he rose, and did eat and drink, and went in the strength of that meat forty days and forty nights unto Horeb the mount of God."

[The English and American interpreters generally pass by in silence, or expressly reject, all attempts to make this and similar miracles intelligible, and resort to an act of divine omnipotence on the part of Him who was the Eternal Word of God, similar to the original act of creation, with this difference, however, that in our case there was a material *substratum* to work on in the five loaves and two fishes, so that it was not a creation out of *nothing*, but an act of creative *accretion;* the bread growing and multiplying in the hands of Christ (so J. A. Alexander, and Owen), or of the distributing apostles (so Alford, following Meyer), or of the eaters, or of all, at all events in such a manner that the whole multitude were abundantly fed, and much more remained and was gathered in the twelve travelling-baskets, than the whole original provision. TRENCH, *Notes on the Miracles*, p. 267 (6th ed., Lond., 1858): "Here, too, even more remarkably than in the case of the water changed into wine, when we seek to realize to ourselves *the manner* of the miracle, it evermore eludes our grasp. We seek in vain to follow it with our imaginations. . . . But this is the wisdom of the sacred narrator, to leave the description of the indescribable unattempted. His appeal is to the same faith which believes 'that the worlds were framed by the Word of God, so that things which are seen, were not made of things which do appear' (Hebr. xi. 3)." J. A. ALEXANDER, *on Matt.* xiv. 21: "The greatness of the miracle consists not merely in the vast increase of nutritive material, but in the nature of the process which effected it, and which must be regarded as *creative*, since it necessarily involves not merely change of form or quality, or new combinations of existing matter, but an absolute addition to the matter itself. . . . The only rational al-

and Numb. xi.), and from the antitype of the Christian eucharist.—P. S.]

* [Hase, and de Wette.]

† [Olshausen's idea of a divinely hastened process of *nature* (*ein beschleunigter Naturprocess*), by which Christ brought about in a moment, what comes to pass by the slow process of growth in several months, does not suffice in the case without the additional hypothesis of a hastened process of *art* (*Kunstprocess*), or the combined labor of mowing, reaping, threshing, grinding, and baking, by which wheat is changed into bread. Nor does the form of the miracle favor this attempt to explain the inexplicable. We should rather expect in this case that the Saviour had cast a few grains of wheat into the ground and made them germinate into a rich harvest at once. But this would have been rather an unnatural miracle, such as the apocryphal Gospel of St. Thomas really ascribes to the child Jesus, at least as regards the quantity of wheat produced from a single grain for the benefit of the poor. (THILO: *Cod. Apocryph.*, p. 302.)—P. S.]

* [As, indeed, God's creatures should not be viewed as dead abstractions, but as possessing living powers and principles, on which the Creator may breathe, giving them new, or rather enlarged capacities; thus working what to the carnal onlooker may seem a miracle, in the sense of being an interference with the course of nature, while the deeper thinker, or the devout believer, sees in it only a *higher order of nature*, the setting free of qualities and powers, bound down by sin, through the operation of an ever-present, almighty, and all-gracious Sovereign.—THE EDINB. TRANSLATOR.]

† [Olshausen adds, however (vol. i., p. 520, in Kendrick's edition): "In these remarks I refer only to the recorded facts; how far it is conceivable that Christ's miraculous powers might have been put forth in a different form, is another question. According to the gospel history, the Saviour constantly appears as the *restorer* of creation. He creates no new men, but He transforms the old; He makes no new bodily members formerly wanting, but He restores the old that were useless."—But on the other hand He raised the dead to life, and is literally and truly the Resurrection and the Life. He brought life and immortality to light. The regeneration of the Spirit, too, is a new birth, a new creation, by which we become "new creatures" in Christ Jesus.—P. S.]

ternative is either to refute the overwhelming proof of authenticity and inspiration, or to accept the passage as the literal record of a genuine creative miracle, the first and greatest in the history [is the raising of Lazarus not equally great if not greater?], and therefore perhaps fully detailed in all the Gospels." Even the German commentator H. A. W. MEYER, so often quoted in this work (*Com. on Matt.*, p. 298 sq. of the 4th ed.), in view of the unanimous testimony and circumstantial agreement of the evangelists, fully admits the miracle, but, in view of its transcendent creative character, renounces all attempts at a rational explanation. He derives the interpretations of Paulus, Strauss, Weisse, de Wette, from a denial of the possible creative working on dead matter, a power which is not explained by the heterogeneous idea of a hastened process of nature (Olshausen), but which stands historically so firm, that we must rest satisfied with its absolute incomprehensibleness (*dass man sich bei der völligen Unbegreiflichkeit dieser möglichen schöpferischen Einwirkung beruhigen muss, auf Veranschaulichung des Processes durch natürliche Analogieen verzichtend*). But compare the forcible second doctrinal reflection of Dr. Lange, which follows.—P. S.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The holy feast spread in the wilderness for the upbuilding of the spiritual Israel is evidently intended as a contrast to the bloody festivities enacted in the palace of Herod, which may be said to have accelerated the ruin of the nation. Here, the curse of sin destroys the enjoyment of the choicest gifts, and the guests at the rich banqueting table are still thirsting for the blood of the prophet. There, heaven's blessing converts a few barley loaves and fishes into a spiritual feast. Thus the holy desert realm of Christ rises in all its beauty and majesty by the side of the crumbling kingdom of the old world, sinking through moral decay. Israel in the wilderness, fed by the manna, may be regarded as the Old Testament type of this history;—as its counterpart, David in the wilderness and in the cave of Adullam, when all who were distressed gathered around him. There is the same contrast, as here, between Saul the persecuting tyrant, and David the anointed of the Lord,—only the excellency, as always, is of the New Dispensation; for if David had to ask the shew-bread from others, Christ gives it to all the people around Him. Nor are similar instances in the history of Christ's people wanting. Severinus, Columbanus, and others, remind us of the miraculous provision (*das Wunderbrod*); while the Waldenses, the Hussites, the Huguenots, [the Puritans], and other of God's persecuted people, have often partaken in the wilderness of such miraculous food. Nor let us forget that since so large a portion of the gifts of earth is devoted to selfishness, luxury, and sin, it is the more incumbent on God's people to devote the remainder to the Lord, in order that, by the blessing of Christ, it may be converted into the miraculous provision of the kingdom of love. Thus is it at all times true, that Jesus, while poor Himself, feeds the hungering people of rich Herod.

2. The Church has rejected the doctrine of *Patripassianism* as a heresy. We would add a warning against a parallel error which we might call *Patrimessianism*, in reference to the miracles of Christ. The distinction between the economy of the Father and of the Son must ever be kept in mind: creation being ascribed to the Father, and redemption—which, however, also includes transformation—to the Son. Hence it is a confusion of these economies to represent as strictly (or rather abstractly and magically) creative acts what really are manifestations of this transforming power. Besides, we must not forget that when the Church repudiated Monophysite views in reference to the person of Christ, the same principle also applies to the manifestation and the economy of the Son. Hence we must always view Him as the God-Man, and all His working as theanthropic. He is the Creator in a moral and religious sense, who above all influences the heart, and who, by and with the heart, transforms all old things into new. Under His word the withered hand moves and extends, along with the withered heart. Perhaps the idea, *that a ban of miscarriage and of barrenness rests on our earthly bread, which Christ removed by this miracle, showing the positive fulness which it contains when His blessing descends upon it*, may, in some measure, help us to understand the grand mystery which awaits us at the final transformation of this world (the transformation of what is mortal, the renovation of the earth, the setting free of its fulness, and the restoration of the tree of life).

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The tidings of the death of the Baptist an indication to the Lord to prepare in retirement.—Infinite riches of Christ even when a fugitive.—The wickedness of Herod could not embitter the heart of Christ.—Despite the opposition of the great of this world, the people were drawn after Him.—How the Lord still rewards with His miracles the confidence that leadeth after Him into the wilderness.—The Lord, who withdrew into the wilderness from the intrusiveness and presumption of the great, is drawn out again by the confidence of the poor and the needy who look up to Him for help.—The compassion of the Lord ever new, and ever assuming new forms.—How the disciples closed the day's work, and how the Master closed it.—The old and the new time as represented by these two sayings: "Send the multitude away," and, "Give ye them to eat."—It is not necessary for them to go away.—It is not necessary to go away from Jesus for anything.—The feast of Herod and the feast of Christ (the former at first a meal of pleasure, then of guilt, and lastly of anxiety and of sorrow; the latter at first a meal of necessity, then of the Spirit, and at last of heavenly transport).—The desert realm of Christ founded in love a figure of His heavenly kingdom.—The Lord gives everything in His kingdom without price: 1. Healing; 2. teaching; 3. provision. The grace before the meal and its effects.—How those around the Lord enter into spiritual fellowship with Him by faith: 1. The Apostles, by inviting to the meal; 2. the people, by gathering around Him.—The miraculous feeding at meeting, and that at parting.—Trust entirely to the blessing of Christ.—Throw open the secret springs of blessing.—Gather the fragments; or, the superabundance of the kingdom of heaven is always combined with the greatest carefulness of its resources.—How the Lord of glory watcheth over His gifts and husbandeth them: 1. In nature (life from death); 2. in grace (Christ made poor); 3. in glory (every thing converted into good).—How the Lord converts the wilderness from a dwelling-place of evil spirits

into a well-spring for the kingdom of heaven: 1. In a literal sense; 2. in a figurative sense.

Starke:—Quesnel: The further Christ appears to remove from us, the more closely should we endeavor to follow Him.—Jesus has never been idle, but has always wrought with His Father, John v. 17; 2 Thess. iii. 8.—It is often unseasonable to listen to the dictates of reason, when we should rather think of the goodness and the omnipotence of God.—Still it is right to use all ordinary and prudent means, since God always honors their employment.—*Hedinger:* Christ can create bread even in the wilderness, Ps. lxxviii. 19.—It matters not with the Lord whether the provision be great or small, Ps. cvii. 36.—It is the Lord who addeth the blessing.—We should bring back to the Lord the bread which we have got from His hand, in order that He may bless it.—Let us not think of the smallness of our provision, but rather of the blessing of God.—*Cramer:* Why weepest thou? the Lord reigneth, Ps. cxlv. 45.—Let us not preserve anything from covetousness, but for future use.—To bestow alms on the needy will never make us poorer.—God can nourish those who have many children quite as readily as those who have none.

Gerlach:—Meat is sanctified by the word of God and prayer, 1 Tim. iv. 5.—Hence the wicked first defile and corrupt the meat, and then, by the meat, themselves.—Those who are desirous of witnessing this glorious miracle must be willing to be content with barley loaves and dry fishes.—*Heubner:* Christ never continued late meetings with a large multitude. His example may therefore be rightly quoted in reference to protracted conventicles at night (still, a Christian congregation can scarcely be placed on the same level with this multitude, comp. Acts xx. 7).—Jesus as the Head of a house.—Grace before meat enjoined by the example of Christ.—Similarly, carefulness, preservation, order, and arrangement taught by His example.—The daily miracle of the feeding of the millions who people our earth.

[*Prudentius:—Tu cibus panisque noster, Tu perennis suavitas; nescit esurire in ævum, qui Tuam sumit dapem.—Trench:* Christ proclaims Himself in this miracle the true bread of the world, that should assuage the hunger of man, the inexhausted and inexhaustible source of all life, in whom there should be enough and to spare for all the spiritual needs of all hungering souls in all ages.—*D. Brown:* (Com. on Mark vi. 35–44): The Bible, so little in bulk, like the five barley loaves and the two fishes, what thousands upon thousands has it fed, and will it feed, in every age, in every land of Christendom, to the world's end!—P. S.]

---

3. *Jesus Walking on the Sea.* CH. XIV. 22–33.

22 And straightway Jesus [he] constrained his disciples to get [enter, ἐμβῆναι] into a
ship, and to go before him unto [to] the other side, while he sent [until he should have
23 sent] the multitudes away. And when he had sent the multitudes away, he went up
into a mountain apart [κατ' ἰδίαν] to pray: and when the evening was come, he was
24 there alone. But the ship was now in the midst of the sea, tossed with [vexed by the]
25 waves: for the wind was contrary. And in the fourth watch of the night [at 3 o'clock,
26 A. M.] Jesus went unto them, walking on [over] the sea.[1] And when the disciples saw
him walking on the sea,[2] they were troubled, saying, It is a spirit [spectre, φάντασμα];
27 and they cried out for fear. But straightway Jesus spake unto them, saying, Be of
28 good cheer: it is I; be not afraid. And Peter answered him and said, Lord, if it be
29 thou, bid me come unto thee on the water. And he said, Come. And when Peter
was come down out of the ship, he[3] walked on [over] the water [ἐπὶ τὰ ὕδατα], to go
30 to Jesus. But when he saw the wind boisterous, he was afraid; and beginning to
31 sink, he cried, saying, Lord, save me. And immediately Jesus stretched forth *his*
hand, and caught [took hold of] him, and said unto him, O thou of little faith, where-
32 fore didst thou doubt? And when they were [had] come [up][4] into the ship, the wind
33 ceased. Then they that were in the ship came and worshipped him, saying, Of a truth
thou art the Son of God [Θεοῦ υἱὸς εἶ].

[1] Ver. 25.—Ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν, B., ℵ., D., al., [Cod. Sinait.], instead of the *lect. recepta:* ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης. [Lange: *dahin schreitend über das Meer;* Ewald: *wandelnd über den See;* Meyer: *über den See hin wandelnd.*—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 26.—Here B., C., D., etc., [Cod. Sinait.], read ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης;—the *text. rec.* with younger MSS.: ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν. [The E. Vers. obliterates the distinction between ἐπὶ τὴν (accusative of motion), and ἐπὶ τῆς (the genitive, of the mere appearing on the lake); as does also the Lat. Vulgate (*super mare* in both cases), and Luther (*auf dem Meer*). The change of case is appropriate. The disciples saw the Lord walking *on* the lake, when He walked *over* the lake to meet them. Comp. the Exeg. Note, and Meyer *in loc.*—P. S.]

[3] Ver. 29.—[Better Conant: *And coming down from the ship, Peter walked,* etc., καταβὰς ἀπὸ τοῦ πλοίου ὁ Πέτρος, κ.τ.λ.—P. S.]

[4] Ver. 32.—[The oldest authorities, including Cod. Sinaiticus, read ἀναβάντων, "when they had come *up*," for the ἐμβάντων of the received text. Tischendorf adheres to the latter, but Lachmann, Tregelles, and Alford adopt the former.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Connection.—The same order as that of the narrative before us is observed in the Gospels of Mark and John. Luke wholly omits the event.

Ver. 22. **Straightway He constrained His disciples,** εὐθέως ἠνάγκασε.—The miraculous feeding had made the strongest impression on the minds of the people, who now wished to make Christ their king, *i. e.*, to proclaim Him Messiah, John vi. 15. On this, as on other occasions, Jesus had considerable difficulty in withdrawing Himself from the multitude, which, according to John, followed Him to the western shore. The reason why Jesus dismissed his disciples was probably their sympathy with the enthusiasm of the people. In proportion as they had at first been encouraged by the success of their apostolic mission, must have been their depression when the tidings of John's martyrdom arrived (Mark vi. 30, 31; Luke ix. 10). This sudden revulsion of feeling rendered them all the more susceptible to impressions such as those evoked by the scene which they had just witnessed. In all likelihood, the proposal to make Jesus king was intended in contrast to the crime of Herod, and was hence all the more dangerous. The Lord tarried behind in order to withdraw Himself the more easily from the people after He had calmed them. Upon a lonely, quiet mountain-top would He offer His sacrifice on that notable and glorious day.

To go before Him.—With Lightfoot and Wieseler, we view the event as follows:—The disciples were not to pass over directly, but only to go before Him along the coast, and to take Him up at the place appointed (πρὸς Βηθσαϊδάν, which Wieseler understands as referring to the eastern Bethsaida, above the mouth of the Jordan). When Jesus had dismissed the people and ascended the mountain, the ship was already a prey to the wind and waves, and driven, contrary to the will of the disciples, into the middle of the sea. (The expression βασανιζόμενον implies that the ship was helpless.) During three watches, or till about three o'clock in the morning, the disciples had vainly endeavored to bring the ship back to the eastern coast, in order to meet the Master near Bethsaida. They were only driven farther westward; and when the Saviour finally came into the ship, they were already quite close to the western shore. While thus laboring till completely exhausted, the Lord Jesus awaited them on the eastern shore. It was under these distressing circumstances that He felt impelled to manifest His miraculous power, in an entirely new manner. Compassion for those who toiled on the sea, and a sense of exaltation over the rebellious element which separated Him from His disciples, determined Him to go forth upon the sea. In this view of the matter, this miracle is as full of meaning and importance as any other of the many displays of His compassion and love.—According to the common view, which is adopted even by Meyer, the Lord had commanded the disciples to pass over before Him; but their passage was much retarded by contrary winds, when He, walking on the sea, overtook them, and calmed the storm. Against this view we have to urge the following considerations: 1. If the above view were correct, we should have expected that the disciples would have asked the Master how he intended to pass over. No other ship than theirs was in waiting (John vi.); nor would it have been possible to have contemplated the long road by land, more especially as the Evangelist speaks of προάγειν, which implies a short passage, until He had dismissed the people. Least of all would the disciples expect that Christ would walk over the sea, else they could not afterward have been afraid and regarded Him as a spectre. 2. If it had been intended that the disciples should have directly passed over, and not have met the Lord on the eastern shore, the journey by which they so soon reached the middle of the sea would have been extremely rapid, and the statement about contrary winds would appear unaccountable. 3. As the disciples were close by the western shore when the Lord came up to them, the miracle which He performed would have been entirely useless if they had hitherto followed their intended destination. On the other hand, we urge in favor of our own interpretation: 1. The terms προάγειν, ἕως,—implying that He intended to join them very shortly. The expression εἰς τὸ πέραν must be explained as meaning, "in the direction of," or "toward the other side," or else "with a view to passing to the other side." 2. If, as John states, Capernaum was their ultimate destination, the obvious interpretation of πρὸς Βηθσαϊδάν would be that it referred to the eastern Bethsaida, not far from the mouth of the Jordan, and that the disciples were to sail along the coast, and there to meet the Lord. 3. Under such circumstances, it would indeed be contrary to their will when they found themselves in the evening in the midst of the sea. The ship had been driven out by a contrary wind, and all their efforts at rowing proved insufficient to counteract its effects. The ship was βασανιζόμενον. 4. According to the account in John, they were close by the western shore when the Saviour joined them, and the wind was still strong. Had it been a westerly wind their difficulties would by that time have been almost overcome, and thus help arrived too late. But here the objection may be urged, that, according to the narrative of Matthew and Mark, the wind was allayed when Jesus entered the ship. It might be argued that the wind, which was contrary to them while they sought to reach the eastern shore, would now be propitious, when, after having received Jesus into the ship, they would steer for the western shore. But a glance at the map will remove this difficulty. From any point on the eastern shore the disciples would require to steer northward in order to reach Julias. A strong northeasterly wind had driven them in an opposite direction and far into the sea. Hence they were probably a good way beyond Capernaum; and if the wind had lasted, it would still have been contrary to them in reference to reaching that port. This also explains the terror of Peter. The Lord came in a northeasterly direction, while Peter, in meeting Him, had to go against wind and waves. 5. Lastly, according to our interpretation of this miracle, it was evidently called forth by the distress of the disciples, which at the same time was symbolical, while the miraculous help afforded them had both a direct and a symbolical import.

Ver. 25. **In the fourth watch of the night,**—*i. e.*, between three and six o'clock in the morning. At an earlier period both the Jews and the Greeks divided the night into three watches, each of four hours. From the time of Pompey, however, they adopted the Roman practice of reckoning four watches, each of three hours, viz., ὀψέ, μεσονύκτιον, ἀλεκτοροφωνία, πρωΐ. (Comp. Winer sub *Nachtwache.*)

Ver. 25, 26. **Over the sea** (ver. 25, ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν, according to the true reading); **on the sea**

ver. 26, ἐπὶ τῆς θαλ.).—The text thus points out a nice, but very important distinction. In ver. 25, the main point of the narrative lies in this, that Jesus hastened over *the sea* to join the disciples; while in ver. 26 the disciples are chiefly struck with the miraculous sight of one walking on the sea. It is scarcely necessary to say that the gloss of Paulus, Stolz, and Gfrörer, "walking on the high *shore* above the sea," is a poor evasion of the difficulty.* Any such idea is completely refuted by the expression περιεπάτησεν ἐπὶ τὰ ὕδατα (ver 29), and by the scene between Christ and Peter, as well as by the impossibility of a conversation carried on between Christ on the shore and the disciples in the midst of the sea [especially during a storm on the lake]. Besides, the terror of the disciples shows that the event was miraculous.

The miracle itself.—It has been regarded: 1. As merely a manifestation of the sway of the Son of God over the elements—a Monophysite view which has lately again been advanced by Meyer.† In reply, it is sufficient to say, that the narrative implies not merely sway over the elements, but also omnipotent sway over the body of the Lord Jesus, which was not a *docetic*, but a real body. 2. We have already adverted to the natural [or rather unnatural, because grammatically and exegetically impossible] explanation by Paulus and others, which is wholly incompatible with the narrative. 3. Some have represented it as merely a natural event, which tradition had clothed in a symbolical or mythical form (Baumgarten-Crusius, Hase, and partly also de Wette). 4. Bolten speaks of swimming (!!). 5. Some have characterized it as a mythical anecdote of the sea, with special reference to 2 Kings ii. 14; vi. 6; Job ix. 8, and to foreign legends (Strauss). 6. Weisse views it allegorically; while, 7. Olshausen holds that our Lord here manifested a power inherent in His higher corporeity. Meyer denounces this view as docetic,—a charge which Olshausen might have retorted with much greater justice; for manifestly, if we suppose that the divinity of Christ had sustained His human nature while walking on the water, we make a complete separation between the two natures in the person of Christ, which after all is *Docetism*. Olshausen is, in the main, right in remarking that it is a mistake to regard the transformation of Christ as the work of a moment, but that this transformation and perfection extended over all His life. We object only to the manner in which he expresses this truth. It were more correct to say, that while the transfiguration of Christ, viewed as *a state*, commenced with His resurrection, the disposition toward it was not only inherent in His body from the first, but increasingly manifested itself and developed during the whole course of His life. Hence also the Lord manifested this glory on special occasions, even before His final sufferings. At His baptism it had appeared in a sign from heaven. Again, at the miracle in Cana, and when miraculously feeding the multitude, it had shone forth, and that not merely as inherent in Him, but as extending to others and working wonders. And now, in the extremity of his disciples, it burst forth in all its majesty; while soon afterward it manifested itself even in a visible manner on the Mount of Transfiguration, for the twofold purpose of showing that the Lord Jesus entered, of His own free choice, upon the path of suffering which now opened before Him, and of confirming the faith of the disciples. From the fact that by faith Peter could share in this matter, we infer that the walking on the sea was a momentary manifestation of a spiritual power, inherent in the body of Christ, which had not as yet appeared. Peter—as indeed our human nature generally—possessed the same inherent power, which represents the germ of the resurrection. But in our present state this power is clogged and fettered by sinfulness; and in this instance is only awakened by the wonder-working word of the Lord, while it again disappears so soon as faith gives place to doubt. Thus this miracle of Christ is a miracle on His own person, just like the miraculous birth, the testimony at His baptism, the transfiguration on the mount, the resurrection, and the ascension—pointing back to the first two, and again forward to these other events. This miracle on Him led to the miracle by Him, or to the summons addressed to Peter to walk with Him on the water. The instances sometimes adduced of somnambulists* and others who have walked on the water can by no means explain this miracle, but they deserve notice as mechanical and pathological manifestations of a power, showing what is possible and inherent in human nature, weighed down as it still is by sin, and concealed by the contrast between the first and the second life. At any rate, they shed a dim light over that world of higher life which the God-Man opened up, and into which Peter for a short space entered, through the operation of faith.

[TRENCH, following Olshausen, Neander, Ullmann, and other German divines, remarks on this miracle (*Notes on the Miracles*, p. 286): "The miracle is not the violation, nor yet the suspension of law, but the incoming of a higher law, as of a spiritual in the midst of natural laws, and the momentary asserting, for that higher law, of the predominance which it was intended to have, and but for man's fall it would always have had, over the lower; and with this a prophetic anticipation of the prevalence which it shall one day recover. Exactly thus was there here the sign of the lordship of man's will, when that will is in absolute harmony with God's will, over external nature. In regard of this very law of gravity, a feeble, and for the most part unconsciously possessed, remnant † of his power survives to man in the well-attested fact that his body is lighter when he is awake than sleeping [as was observed even by Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* vii. 18]; a fact which every man who has carried a child would be able to attest. From this we conclude that the human consciousness, as an inner centre, works as an opposing force to the attrac-

* [The preposition ἐπί with the genitive may mean: *on the bank of*, but only after verbs of rest, as in John xxi. 1 (ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης τῆς Τιβεριάδος), not after verbs of motion, as περιπατεῖν, and still less with the accusative. —P. S.]

† [I can see no monophysitism in Meyer, who simply says *in loc.* (p. 300): "Die Sache bleibt *ein wunderbares Gehen auf dem See*, welches .... unter den Gesichtspunkt der Christo als Sohn Gottes inwohnenden Herrschaft über die Elemente und ihre Kräfte zu stellen, hinsichtlich des *Wie* der Ausführung aber völlig unbestimmbar ist;" *i. e.*, Meyer admits here a supernatural miracle, which must be derived from Christ's power over nature dwelling in Him as the Son of God, but the exact mode of which cannot be defined.—P. S.]

* *Die Seherin von Prevorst*, i. 77.

† [This collocation of words, placing two or more adjectives, which are defined by adverbs, *before* the noun, is a palpable Germanism, which to the English ear sounds heavy and inelegant. It is strange that Dr. Trench, who wrote such readable books on the English language, and the study of words, and is otherwise a fresh, racy, and idiomatic writer, should be frequently so careless and nonchalant in his style.—P. S.]

tion of the earth and the centripetal force of gravity, however unable now to overbear it."—P. S.]

Ver. 26. **It is a ghost, or a spectre** [not *spirit*, as in the E. V.], φάντασμά [not πνεῦμα] ἐστιν.—Their belief in the apparition of spectres is here presupposed. The vivid sketch of their sudden terror may be regarded as an indirect evidence of the faithfulness of the narrative. They seem to have regarded the apparition as an indication of coming evil.—According to the narrative of John, they were already between twenty-five and thirty furlongs from the eastern shore, *i. e.*, across about three fourths of the lake.

Ver. 28. [Alford: "This narrative respecting Peter is peculiar to Matthew. It is in very strict accordance with his warm and confident character, and has been called almost a 'rehearsal' of his denial afterward. It contains one of the most pointed and striking revelations which we have of the *nature* and *analogy of faith*, and a notable example of the power of the higher spiritual state of man over the inferior laws of matter, so often brought forward by our Lord. *See* ch. xvii. 20; xxi. 21."—Peter's fault lay in the words: "Bid *me*," which betray an ambitious and overconfident desire to outdo and outdare the other disciples, and may be regarded as a prelude of the boastful: "Although *all* shall be offended at Thee, yet will not *I*."—P. S.]

Ver. 29. **And He said: Come!**—One of those commands of sovereignty which prove that the Lord possessed the full consciousness of His power. [But it is more probably the permissive *Come*, *i. e.*, "Make the experiment, if thou desirest." The Lord knew that Peter's courage would fail him.—P. S.]

Ver. 30. **But when he saw the wind boisterous,**—*i. e.*, the high waves, impelled by the wind, rushing against him. [As long as Peter looked to Jesus only, he rose by faith over the elements of nature; but as soon as he looked away from Jesus to the boisterous waves, he began to doubt, to despond, and to sink.—P. S.]

Ver. 31. **Wherefore didst thou doubt?**—Διστάζειν means properly, to turn irresolutely in two directions, to waver, Matt. xxviii. 17. Πρῶτον μὲν ἐθάῤῥησας, ὕστερον δὲ ἐδειλίασας. Euth. Zigabenus.

Ver. 32. **And when they were come into the ship.**—Meyer: "According to the narrative in John, Christ did not enter the ship, though the disciples were *willing* to receive Him. An actual though unimportant discrepancy." Olshausen accounts for the difficulty by remarking that the disciples at first sought to avoid what they regarded as a spectre; but when they recognized the Lord, they were anxious to receive Him,—which implied, as a matter of course, that He actually entered the ship. Again, in the Gospel of Mark, we read: ἤθελε παρελθεῖν αὐτούς. Apparently it had been the intention of Christ to precede the disciples, and to point out the direction in which to follow Him. This intention was afterward modified by the occurrence with Peter. Accordingly, we interpret the narrative in John as follows: They were willing to receive Him into the ship on the eastern shore at the commencement of their passage, and now (after the scene on the sea, and His entering the ship, which John passes over) they were immediately at the western coast, whither they went. Thus Christ had passed over the greater part of the sea before meeting the disciples.

Ver. 33. **Of a truth Thou art the [a] Son of God.**—Not merely the Messiah in the ordinary sense, but with special reference to His divine character as revealed in the New Testament. Meyer: "According to Matthew, Jesus is here for the first time owned by man as the Son of God (iii. 17; iv. 3; viii. 29)." [The persons here introduced as οἱ ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ, were probably the crew of the ship, *the boatmen, the mariners*, and perhaps some other passengers, as distinct from the disciples; comp. vers. 15, 19, 22, 26, and οἱ ἄνθρωποι, ch. viii. 27. So Jerome: *Nautæ atque vectores*. Jerome adds: "The sailors acknowledge Him to be truly the Son of God on witnessing one miracle, the calming of the tempest: yet Arius proclaims Him to be a mere creature." But it should not be overlooked that the omission of the article before υἱός generalizes the meaning of the term. Christ is more than *a* sòn of God, He is *the* Son of God, in a unique and absolute sense, as He is *the* Son of Man. The mariners, however, being probably Jews, could not understand the term in a polytheistic sense, and meant to infer from Christ's control over the elements that He was clothed with divine power.—P. S.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. On the miracle itself, *see* the exegetical notes.

2. Scripture often compares the people with the sea and its waves (Ps. xlvi.; Dan. vii. 3; Rev. xiii. 1). Christ had just assuaged a storm on land, which had almost swept away the disciples. The same scene is now re-enacted in a figurative manner. Jesus sways the waves of the sea as He had calmed those of the people, and as He shall sway those of the nations. But the Apostles are unequal to the emergency. *And when Peter ventures for a while to walk with the Lord on the waves, he soon sinks in the storm, and is only preserved when Christ brings him back into the ship which contains the rest of the Apostles, with the reproof: O thou of little faith, wherefore didst thou doubt?*

3. Along with a view of the exaltation of Christ over all nature, we here obtain a glimpse not only of the future glory of the children of God, but also how the throes and struggles of nature are calmed and cease at the feet of Jesus. The narrative contains *three miracles combined*. The first prefigured and introduced Christ's resurrection and ascension. From the second we learn how, even upon earth, believers may, in anticipation of their future glory, triumph and conquer in the midst of waves or flames. The third affords us an insight how nature herself shall be delivered from her subjection to vanity into the glorious liberty of the children of God. Lastly, we have here a typical prophecy of the future dominion of the spirit of Christianity over the sea of nations. A *British* painter, H. Richter, has given us the most affecting representation of Christ's walking over the sea.

4. Shortly before this, Christ had conquered two giants which ever endanger society—famine, and revolutionary attempts to establish a new millennium. By removing the terrors of the deep, He overcame a third and equally great danger. In the interval He had been on the mount. *From the mountain of prayer did the great Captain of humanity conduct all His wars, and gain all His conquests.* But Christ preferred to meet these three giants, rather than trust Himself to the whims of that despot who, after having murdered the Baptist, showed a disposition to condescend to Himself.

5. From that time forward commenced the sway of the Spirit of Christ, by which He will ultimately subdue these three giants in the world.

6. It is true that Peter could swim; but in his terror he lost not only his spiritual, but even his natural, attainments.

[TRENCH: Peter is here the image of all the faithful of all ages, in the seasons of their weakness and their fear. So long as they are strong in faith, they are able to tread under foot all the most turbulent agitations of an unquiet world; but when they lose heart and fear, they begin to sink; and were it not for Christ's sustaining hand, which is stretched out in answer to their cry, they would be wholly overwhelmed and swallowed up.—P. S.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Christ walking on the sea: 1. He goes *over* the sea to bring help; and hence walks, 2. *on* the sea, displaying His omnipotence. — The three miracles combined prefiguring the threefold transfiguration: 1. Of the Lord; 2. of believers; 3. of nature (Rom. viii.).—Why the Lord constrained His disciples to quit the multitude; or, the dangers accruing to the Church from the enthusiasm of popular excitement. —Christ had as frequently to withdraw from the people as to go and meet them.—The disciples would have sent away the people when they were hungry; Christ dismisses them when they were too well satisfied.—Jesus, in those nights of prayer solitary on mountains, alone with His Father.—The lonely nights of the Saviour, of which the blessing descends on the world in the light of day.—The disciples driven by the sea from the Lord until the fourth watch: 1. In the gospel narrative; 2. in the history of the Church. —How the necessity of the disciples evokes the most glorious power of the Lord.—The miracles occasioned by the need of His people.—How the fear of spirits increases a thousandfold the real terrors of life.—The fear of spectres: 1. The truth lying at the foundation of it; 2. its errors and dangers.—Sad self-deception on the part of the disciples: to be afraid of their Lord and Saviour as if He had been a spectre.—How the disciples in the ship of the Church still cry out from fear, whenever the Lord comes over the waves with a new display of His glory.—How they imagine that the Lord Himself is always obliged to pass over in a vessel.—How the world will be set free from its fear of spectres: 1. From superstition, by faith; 2. from apparitions, by miracles; 3. from fear, by peace; 4. from crying out, by giving praise.—"Be of good cheer: *it is I;* be not afraid."—The reply of Peter: "Lord, *if it* be Thou,"—indicating the appearance of uncertainty in the midst of faith.—The faith of Peter.—The character of Peter the same here as at the time of Christ's last sufferings, and during his later apostolate (Acts ii. x.; Gal. ii.).—The history of Peter on the sea, a prelude to his fall.—"And He said: Come."—How it clearly appears that the Lord grants help only on condition of a faith, which, however, Himself has called forth.—Origin of doubt: he looked much at the wind, and little at the Lord. —How the Lord rescues His own from all depths of the sea.—Jesus, the Saviour of His people amid the terrors of the sea.—Christ an all-sufficient Saviour both at sea and on land.—The Spirit of Christ in His victory over the resistance of nature.—If our strength prove insufficient to bring us to Christ, His strength is sufficient to bring Him to us.—How unexpectedly at the end of the journey!—They wished to land on the eastern, but landed on the western shore.—The first confession of the Messiah as the Son of God, the fruit of a night of unparalleled terror.—The most glorious success following the most hopeless toil.— Evening and morning witnessing the miracles of the Lord.—How Christ ever reminds us of His former miracles by working new wonders.—"They worshipped Him;" or, the homage due to Christ as king.— Christ walking on the sea, a prelude to the history of His sufferings and resurrection: 1. Christ separated by the people from His disciples; 2. Christ lost to view in the darkness of night on the other shore; 3. the disciples driven from Him, and toiling in deep sorrow and need; 4. the miraculous reappearance of Christ: fear and joy.

Starke:—Quesnel: An humble person will withdraw from praise and glory.—*Zeisius:* The word which we have heard and learned must be evidenced by the cross.—*Osiander:* The kingdom of Christ not of this world.—Christ withdrew from worldly honors, while we seek them; is this to follow after Him?—*J. Hall:* Worldly prosperity is more dangerous than adversity.—If Christ was thus instant in prayer, how much more should we wrestle in it!— The quiet of evening the time for prayer.—Alone with God.—*Quesnel:* The Church like a ship in the midst of the sea.—God leads His own people often in strange, but always in a blessed and holy, way, Ps. iv. 3.—If Jesus be absent, there is only misery and temptation. *Nov. Bibl. Tub.—J. Hall:* Man's extremity is God's opportunity.—New wants will bring fresh help and fresh experiences.—*Hedinger:* The heart of man is unstable,—bold now, and again fearful, Jer. xvii. 9.—*Bibl. Wurt.:* Alas! how fearful do believers often become in their difficulties and sorrows.—*Canstein:* Even believers are afraid when God comes to them in an unusual way.—*J. Hall:* The gracious help of Christ comes always at the right moment.—"It is *I;*" I am with thee in trouble, Ps. xci. 15.—The confidence of Christians.—The assurance of Christ's gracious presence the greatest comfort of Christians in their deepest sorrows.—*Hall:* A good sheep knows even the voice of its shepherd, John x. 4.—Lord, bid me come unto Thee.—The word of Christ a strong bridge.—With God we can achieve mighty things.—Nature and grace side by side.—However good our purpose, it is shaken by temptation.—*Bibl. Wurt.:* Beware of being too bold. —Christ does not suffer us to sink in our weakness. —*Quesnel:* It is good for Christians that God from time to time allows them to feel their weakness and their impotence.—Our help is in the name of the Lord.—The Lord sometimes allows His people to sink, but only in order to humble them.—*Osiander:* To doubt the help of God, must lead to adversity; therefore keep firm hold of the promise, and do not sink, Isa. xliii. 12.—*Canstein:* The Lord ministers to His ministers more than they minister to Him.—*Zeisius:* Christ the wonder-worker, whom even the wind and waves obey.—*Quesnel:* A consideration of the miracles of Jesus tending to strengthen our faith.—Christ claiming our worship, Phil. ii. 10.

Gerlach: The glorified body of Christ was, as it were, visible even through His earthly body; ch. xvii. Hence the waves were like firm soil under Him; just as Christ passed through the world untouched by human corruption and unmoved by the passions around Him.—In his faith and deep attachment to Jesus, Peter can no longer bear the uncertainty. As on other

occasions, so now, he precedes the other disciples; but not knowing his own weakness, he soon fails.—Greater than common demands are made upon those who come prominently forward; but if their temptations are stronger, their deliverances are also more glorious.

Heubner :—In the history of Christ, work and prayer always succeeded each other. *Ora et labora.* —His need of solitude.—God allows sorrow to befall us because He foresees its end.—When He is absent, rest is wanting.—When the Helper is expected, He is already present.—He knows the need of His people.—The presence of Jesus drives away all fear.—Peter feels his human impotence only when he is on the water; *i. e.*, when he has progressed beyond human experience and strength into the domain of faith, where the power of God alone can sustain him. He now feels that he has passed beyond the limits of human nature, and this sense overpowers him (but only because his heart is divided).—Faith can never wholly sink; it takes hold of the right hand of the Lord.

[*Augustine*:—*Amas Deum, ambulas super mare: sub pedibus tuis est seculi tumor. Amas seculum, absorbebit te.*—*Chrysostom:* We need not fear the tempest, but only the weakness of our faith. Hence Christ does not calm the storm, but takes Peter by the hand.—It is of no use to be near Christ in person, unless we are near Him by faith.—*Wordsworth:* Peter was enabled by Christ to walk on the sea; so the risen bodies of the saints will be enabled to fly upward and meet Him in the air, 1 Thess. iv. 17.—Peter sinks without Christ. (Think of the Church of Rome in her errors.)—P. S.]

C. CHRIST MANIFESTS HIMSELF AS THE HIGH PRIEST IN HIS SUFFERINGS; BEING REJECTED BY THE SCRIBES AND PHARISEES OF JERUSALEM, OR THE THEOLOGICAL AUTHORITIES OF THE SCHOOLS.

Chapter XIV. 34–36, XV. 1–38.

Contents:—Secret landing of the Lord in Galilee, and His recognition. Accusation of the deputation from the synagogue at Jerusalem, that His disciples transgressed the traditions. Reply of Jesus, and rebuke addressed to the Pharisees of Galilee. Christ's teaching to the disciples in reference to tradition. Jesus journeying into the heathen country of Tyre and Sidon, and the woman of Canaan. Second miraculous feeding of the multitude; or, second realm in the desert, as contrasted with that of the spiritual authorities, which allowed the people to perish from want.

---

1. *The deputation from Jerusalem, and the rebuke of Jesus addressed to the Pharisees of Galilee. Christ's teaching to the disciples in reference to tradition.* Ch. XIV. 34–36, XV. 1–20.

Ch. XIV. 34 And when they were gone [had passed] over,[1] they came into the land of
35 Gennesaret. And when the men of that place had knowledge of him,[2] they sent out
36 into all that country round about,[3] and brought unto him all that were diseased; And
besought him that they might only touch the hem [fringe][4] of his garment: and as
many as touched were made perfectly whole.[5]
Ch. XV. 1 Then came to Jesus scribes and Pharisees which [who] were of Jerusalem,[6]
2 saying, Why do thy disciples transgress the tradition of the elders? for they wash not
3 their hands when they eat bread. But he answered and said unto them, Why do ye also
4 transgress the commandment of God by [because of][7] your tradition? For God commanded, saying,[8] Honour thy father and mother: and, He that curseth father or mother,
5 let him die the death [surely die].[9] But ye say, Whosoever shall say to *his*[10] father
or *his*[10] mother, *It is* a gift [devoted to God, a sacrifice], by whatsoever thou mightest be
6 profited by me; And honour not his father or his mother, *he shall be free.*[11] Thus have
ye made the commandment [law][12] of God of none [no] effect by [because of] your
7, 8 tradition. *Ye* hypocrites, well did Esaias [Isaiah] prophesy of you, saying, This
people draweth nigh unto me with their mouth,[13] and honoureth me with *their* lips;
9 but their heart is far from me. [Is. xxix. 13.] But in vain they do worship me,
10 teaching *for* [as] doctrines the commandments of men. And [then] he called the mul-
11 titude, and said unto them, Hear, and understand: Not that which goeth into the mouth
defileth a [the] man [*i. e.*, makes him legally unclean]; but that which cometh out of the
12 mouth, this defileth a [the] man. Then came his disciples, and said unto him, Know-
13 est thou that the Pharisees were offended, after they heard this saying? But he an-

swered and said, Every plant, which my heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be
14 rooted up. Let them alone: they be [are, εἰσι] blind leaders of the blind. And if the
15 blind lead the blind, both shall [will] fall into the ditch. Then answered Peter and
16 said unto him, Declare unto us this parable. And Jesus said, Are ye also yet without
17 understanding? Do not ye yet [Do ye not][14] understand, that whatsoever entereth in
18 at the mouth goeth into the belly, and is cast out into the draught? But those things
which proceed out of the mouth come forth from the heart; and they defile the man.
19 For out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false
20 witness, blasphemies: These are *the things* which defile a [the] man: but to eat with
unwashen hands defileth not a [the][15] man.

[1] Ch. xiv., ver. 34.—[Διαπεράσαντες, Ewald and Lange: *da sie hinübergeschifft waren;* G. Campbell: *having passed over;* A. Norton, Conant, and the N. T. of the A. B. U.: *passing over;* Rheims and Archbishop Kendrick (*The Four Gospels*, N. Y., 1849): *having passed the water;* Wiclif: *whanne thei hadden passid ouer the see.*—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 35.—[Lange: *da die Leute . . . Ihn erkannten;* Norton: *when they saw who he was;* Campbell, and Conant: *knowing him*, ἐπιγνόντες αὐτόν.—P. S.]

[3] Ver. 35.—[Εἰς ὅλην τὴν περίχωρον ἐκείνην, *into the whole neighboring country;* Lange: *in die ganze Umgegend;* Campbell: *through all that country;* Conant: *into all that country round* (omitting only the *about* of the E. V.—P. S.]

[4] Ver. 36.—[Κράσπεδα correspond to the צִיצִית, which the Jews were directed to wear on the corners of the outer garments, Num. xv. 38 sq. Campbell, and Kendrick translate: *tuft;* Norton, and Conant: *fringe;* all the older English versions to A. D. 1611: *hem.*—P. S.]

[5] Ver. 36.—[Campbell, Norton, and Conant drop: *perfectly;* but Lange retains it: (*vollständig*) *geheilt*, διεσώθησαν; Meyer: *sie wurden durchgerettet*, so dass sie sofort gesund aus der Krankheit hervorgingen.—P. S.]

[6] Ch. xv., ver. 1.—[Simpler and better with modern translators and revisers: *Pharisees and Scribes from Jerusalem* (dropping: *which were*), even in case we retain the article οἱ before ἀπό, which is omitted in the authorities of Lachmann and Tregelles, and also in Cod. Sinaiticus.—P. S.]

[7] Ver. 3.—[Διὰ τὴν παράδοσιν ὑμῶν, or *on account of*, or *for the sake of* (Conant), but not: *on the pretense of* (Norton), nor: *by* (E. V. and Campbell). The preposition διά with the accusative seldom, if ever, denotes instrumentality; besides this would not suit the connection; for, as Conant correctly remarks, "it was *regard for tradition*, as of higher worth and authority, which led them to set aside the word of God, and it is this with which they are here charged." The Vulgate correctly translates: *propter traditionem vestram;* the Peschito (Syriac V.) likewise: *on account of your tradition;* Wiclif, Rheims: *for your tradition;* Cranmer: *because of;* Tyndale and Geneva B. falsely: *through*, for which the Bishops' B. and King James' B. substituted *by*. All the good German versions have: *um . . willen*, or *wegen*, *on account of.*—P. S.]

[8] Ver. 4.—[So according to the reading: ἐνετείλατο λέγων. But the older reading of manuscripts, versions, and patristic citations, is εἶπε, *said* (without *commanded*). So Lachm. and Tischend., while Alford retains ἐνετείλατο λέγων. Lange puts *geboten und* (*commanded and*) in smaller type in parenthesis.—P. S.]

[9] Ver. 4.—[Θανάτῳ τελευτάτω, lit.: *shall end by death, shall be executed*, the inaccurate LXX rendering of the intensive Hebrew form מוֹת יוּמָת, Ex. xxi. 17; Lev. xx. 9.—P. S.]

[10] Ver. 5.—[*His* before *father* and *mother*, need not be italicized; the definite article in Greek (τῷ πατρὶ ἢ τῇ μητρί) having here the force of our possessive pronoun.—P. S.]

[11] Vers. 5 and 6.—[The translation of this somewhat difficult sentence, which is generally regarded as elliptical, but not necessarily so, depends partly on the construction (*see* Exeg. Notes), partly on the reading. The common text reads, ver. 6: οὐ μὴ τιμήσῃ (which the E. V. co-ordinates with ἂν εἴπῃ, as a second part of the *protasis: whosoever shall say . . . and honor not*); but the majority of ancient critical authorities are in favor of the future: οὐ μὴ τιμήσει, either with καί (so Tischendorf and Alford), or without καί (as Lachmann and Tregelles read). The Cod. Sinait. likewise omits καί, but reads τιμηση, and inserts after ὠφεληθῇς the words: ουδεν εστιν, which I have not seen in any other manuscript or critical apparatus (the reading is: ουδεν εστιν ου μη τιμηση τον πρα, abridged for πατέρα, etc.). The choice lies between the following explanatory translations: (1) *But ye say:* "*Whoever saith to his father or mother: 'A gift'* [*i. e.*, it is an offering consecrated to God, and therefore not alienable to other use], '*whatsoever thou mightest be profited with from me*' [*i. e.*, by which I might support thee]; *and honor not* (καὶ οὐ μὴ τιμήσῃ, coördinate with ἂν εἴπῃ, and second member of the *protasis*) *his father or his mother* . . ." (supply the *apodosis: he shall be free*, or *is free*, viz., from the obligation of the fifth commandment). *And* [words of the Saviour] *ye have made the law of God of no effect, for the sake of your tradition.* (2) Or, if we read (καὶ) οὐ μὴ τιμήσει, and commence here the words of the Lord, we must translate: *But ye say:* "*Whoever saith to his father or his mother: 'It is a gift* [*i. e.*, an inalienable altar-offering] *from which thou mightest be benefited by me,'*" . . . [supply the *apodosis* of the Pharisees: *the same is not bound to honor or support his parents*, since by doing so he would violate his vow, or alienate what belongs to God]. (*And*) *he* [words of Christ] *shall in no wise honor his father or his mother. And thus ye have made the law of God of no effect*, etc. So Meyer and Lange. But this ellipsis seems somewhat forced and unnatural. (3) Or, finally, we may regard the second clause, with Grotius, Bengel, Winer, and Conant, as the *apodosis*, no matter whether we read: καὶ οὐ μὴ τιμήσῃ, or οὐ μὴ τιμήσει. I prefer the latter (without καί) as the older reading, and explain: *But ye say:* "*Whoever saith*, etc., *he* (the same) *shall in no wise honor his father or his mother.*" *Thus have ye*, etc. This explanation avoids the hypothesis of an *aposiopesis* and requires no supplement of an *apodosis;* it also retains the full force of οὐ μή, a strong negative asseveration, which in connection with the future expresses earnest dissuasion or positive prohibition (as in Matt. xvi. 22: οὐ μὴ ἔσται σοι τοῦτο). If we retain καί we must explain it, with Winer: "*he too*," *i. e.*, in such a case (comp. Winer's *Grammatik*, etc., §64 sub *aposiopesis*, p. 529, note: *wer zu seinen Eltern spricht . . . der braucht auch—in diesem Falle—seine Eltern nicht zu ehren*), or render with Scrivener: *he shall not then honor.* At all events it seems to me most natural to regard the second clause as the *apodosis* of the Pharisees, which expresses their decision and neutralizes the fifth commandment. The Saviour thinks it unnecessary to refute them and simply states the result: *Thus ye have made the law of God of no effect.*—Conant observes, that the ellipsis in the Common Version: *he shall be free*, "is supplied from Beza's Latin Version: *insons erit*, and is one of the many evidences of its influence (often injurious) on King James' revisers."—P. S.]

[12] Ver. 6.—[The authorities are divided between τὴν ἐντολήν, *the commandment*, τὸν νόμον, *the law*, (Tischend., Alford), and τὸν λόγον, *the word* (Lachm. and Tregelles.—P. S.]

[13] Ver. 8.—The words of the *text. rec.:* ἐγγίζει μοι ὁ λαὸς οὗτος τῷ στόματι αὐτῶν, are wanting in the oldest

authorities [including Cod. Sinait.], and omitted in all critical editions [since Griesbach]. Probably an insertion from the Septuagint.

[14] Ver. 17.—[Leave out *yet*. The best authorities and editions read *οὐ*, *not*, for *οὔπω*, *not yet*. Dr. Lange includes *noch*, *yet*, in parenthesis.—P. S.]

[15] Ver. 20.—[The Greek has always the definite article before *ἄνθρωπος* in this section, and the E. Vers. thus renders it in ver. 18: *defile the man*.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 34. **Into the land of Gennesaret.**—As the time of persecution had commenced, they probably landed on a retired part of the coast. This appears, 1. from the manner in which the place where they landed is described; 2. from the circumstance that the people of that place brought sick persons from the scattered houses in the district, and that, according to Mark, Jesus passed through villages and towns before He appeared in the synagogue at Capernaum; while, lastly, this view is also supported by the analogous account of the landing, contained in ch. xv. 39. The designation, "land of Gennesaret," Mark vi. 53, was given to the western shore of the lake; from which, indeed, the latter derived its name. According to Josephus (*De Bello Jud.* 3, 10, 8), the district extended 30 furlongs in length and 20 in breadth, so that it must have comprised only a part of the western shore. *Robinson* (ii. p. 400) suggests that it extended from Khân Minyeh on the north to Mejdel on the south; in which case it would nearly embrace the modern district of el-Ghuweir, or the "Little Ghôr." According to Josephus, the climate of this district was very mild, and the soil fertile.

Ver. 35. **And when the men of that place had knowledge of Him.**—Meanwhile morning had dawned, and Jesus was immediately recognized by the people.

Ver. 36. **The fringe of His garment.**—Comp. ix. 20. Christ merely passed through the district, and the haste of His journey accounts for the manner in which the cures were performed; the expression being at the same time symbolical, and indicating on the one hand the most passing touch, and on the other the strong faith of the people in that district. We might almost have expected that tradition would have laid the scene of healing the woman with the issue of blood in the country of Gennesaret instead of at Paneas. If that woman lived here after she was restored, we may perhaps conjecture that ever afterward special importance attached in the mind of the people to this mode of healing. But we must remind the reader that Jesus passed through the lower district of the sea-shore when He performed that miracle.

Ch. xv. 1. **Then met Jesus,** etc.—The following three sections (about the washing of hands, the woman of Canaan, and the second feeding of the multitude) are only related by Matthew and by Mark. Between these events and those formerly related, we must insert the address of Jesus, in the synagogue at Capernaum, concerning the manna of heaven (John vi. 22–71), as also the festival of Easter, which, according to John vi., was close at hand, even at the first feeding of the multitude. From Luke x. 38, we would infer that Jesus had on that occasion tarried in Bethany, while the disciples went on to Jerusalem. In the Jewish capital, the disciples seem to have given offence by their bold statements and by the evangelical liberty of their conduct. Hence Jesus was now charged with heresy in Galilee, and was watched in the field. Then followed the healing of the man with the withered hand, and of him who was possessed with a blind and dumb devil, the last conflict between Jesus and the Pharisees of Galilee, the parables and probably the events recorded in Luke xiii. 1–9 and 11–17. Meantime, the deputation of Pharisees and scribes, with which our section opens, had arrived from Jerusalem; having been despatched partly on account of the offence which the disciples had given in the holy city, and partly on account of the report of the Pharisees of Galilee, to the effect that Jesus was too powerful for them, and that they required assistance from the capital.—The arrangement of Matthew follows the order of things more than of time. After having related how the Lord was repelled by the ruler of Galilee, he now records the conflict between Jesus and the supreme authorities of the synagogue.

The Pharisees and Scribes.—With the article.* We adopt the arrangement of Codd. B., D., Orig., etc., by which the Pharisees are mentioned before the scribes, although this is opposed by Lachmann and Tischendorf. The persecution at Jerusalem originated with the Pharisees, the scribes having given it a proper legal form in the shape of a deputation from the synagogue. This is no doubt indicated by the use of the article, and not, as Meyer supposes, "the scribes who lived in Jerusalem and had come thence." The deputation represented the whole body of the Pharisees and scribes in Jerusalem. There are references to several such deputations in the New Testament.

Ver. 2. **Why do Thy disciples transgress?**—Referring to the occasion to which we have above alluded. The charge is at first urged in a cautious manner, although the Master is made responsible for the supposed transgressions of His disciples.—**The tradition,** *παράδοσις*.—A new and more dangerous mode of attack. Hitherto they had only charged Him with violating the Sabbath, or with supposed transgressions of the law itself. But now they based their accusations upon tradition, as of acknowledged authority. The miraculous cures of Jesus and His teaching might be urged in answer to their charges of violation of the law; but the disciples were apparently transgressing the traditions without any excuse for it. The *παράδοσις, ἄγραφος διδασκαλία*. Hesychius. *See* the Sermon on the Mount. Within the circle of His disciples, Jesus had from the first declared Himself opposed to traditions, but their renunciation on the part of His followers had only of late appeared. This charge of the Pharisees is illustrated by the following extract. Meyer: "The Jews attached greater value to tradition than even to the written law, appealing in support of it to Deut. iv. 14; xvii. 10. More especially did they pay respect to the traditionary injunction of washing the hands before meals, to which it was thought Lev. xv. 11 referred. See Lightfoot, Schöttgen, and Wetstein on the passage." Jesus did not reject this tradition, viewing it merely as a custom (which was also common among the Persians, Greeks, and Romans). He

* [*See* my critical note 6, p. 275. Cod. Sinait likewise puts the *Pharisees* first.—P. S.]

only refused to recognize it as a binding or religious ordinance, and hence omitted it in urgent circumstances. The whole passage may be regarded as throwing a peculiar light upon the history of Pharisaism, with its "hedge around the law," and upon that of the Sanhedrim and of the Talmud.

Of the elders.—Fritzsche: The teachers of the law. Meyer: Our ancestors, with special reference to Heb. xi. 2. But we must not forget that the official *πρεσβύτεροι* of the Sanhedrin and of the synagogues were the theocratic authorities which administered and sanctioned the traditions of their ancestors.

Ver. 4. **Let him die the death.**—In the original Hebrew: מוֹת יוּמַת, *he shall surely die.* The *Sept.* renders it, *he shall end by death* (by execution): *θανάτῳ τελευτάτω.*

Ver. 5. **But ye say.**—The change of the verb deserves notice. It is a **gift,** *δῶρον*, קָרְבָּן, a sacrifice or gift to the temple. There are two significant omissions in the phraseology of the text. 1. *ἐστί* or *ἔσται* is omitted. If a person *merely pronounced* the word "*Corban*" over any possession or property, it was irrevocably dedicated to the temple. Thus it became a kind of interdict. Compare Lightfoot, von Ammon ii. 226. Mishna, נדרים, *de votis.* Joseph. *Contr. Ap.* 1, 22.—2. "But ye say, or make the tradition, Whosoever shall say to his father, or his mother, It is a gift! that with which thou mightest be assisted by me," . . . Here Jesus breaks off and allows His opponents to state their own conclusion, which was as follows: "he is free of his duty as a child." The Lord seems unwilling to draw, or at least to state, the sinful conclusion at which Pharisaism had arrived. Hence the *aposiopesis*, which appears most clearly in the language of Mark, is peculiarly suitable.* Perhaps the inference might have been differently expressed by some of the Rabbins. Jesus, however, draws his own conclusion,† which is: He will surely not honor his father or his mother. So Meyer. But Grotius, Bengel, and Winer regard this clause as being the words of the Pharisees themselves, implying: He need not honor his father, etc. But this view is improbable in itself, and contrary to the language of the text. [Not at all. Comp. my critical note 11 on vers. 5 and 6, p. 275.—P. S.]

Ver. 6. **Made of no effect.**—More than merely "transgressed." Some Rabbins (as Rabbi Eliezer) regarded the duty of children to honor their parents as higher than all the commandments. But the Jewish authorities insisted that vows, even if incompatible with this injunction, were binding.

Ver. 7. **Well (aptly, *καλῶς*) did Isaiah prophesy of you.** Is. xxix. 13.—Not in the sense of natural inspiration (de Wette), nor of prediction in the strictest sense (Meyer), nor merely of application (Maldonatus); but as in Matt. xiii. 14 sqq. with special reference to Isa. vi. We have here the other aspect of the hardening to which the prophet referred, in the shape of a pretended sanctity. As the statement of Isaiah in reference to the *hardening* of his cotemporaries was completely fulfilled in the cotemporaries of Jesus, so also his statement about their pretended sanctity; in other words, his verbal prophecy about his cotemporaries was, in this respect also, a typical prophecy of the times of Jesus.

Ver. 9. **In vain,** *μάτην*.—Meyer explains the expression as implying that it was *fruitless* (without moral result) and *groundless* (*temere*). In our opinion, it expresses the idea of *emptiness* or *vanity*, which includes *groundlessness* in point of principle, and *fruitlessness* so far as results were concerned. The Hebrew text has no expression corresponding to this *μάτην*; but the *Sept.* may probably have translated from another reading.

Ver. 10. **Then He called the multitude.**—The Saviour turns away from these hypocrites, whose questions about the washing of the hands He does not even condescend to answer, since out of their own mouths they were convinced of making the commandments of God of no effect. Christ now turns to the people, and instructs them in the difference between Levitical and real defilement.

Ver. 11. **Not that which goeth into the mouth defileth;**—*i. e.*, with reference to the relation between Levitical defilement and the חל, or *profanus*, in the real sense of the term. The Lord presents the Levitical idea of impurity in a moral light. The question is not—to take the present instance—to be decided by the physical mouth (or the use of certain meats), but by the moral mouth (or the language). What is here said concerning the going into and coming out of the mouth, applies to the whole series of Levitical and moral injunctions concerning purity. The statement was in the first place, indeed, intended as a justification of His disciples on the charge brought against them by the Pharisees. But the inference was obvious, that all these injunctions required to be fulfilled in a higher sense (although this did not imply that the Lord denied their validity as Levitical ordinances). As a matter of course, when the symbol would be completely fulfilled, its outward representation must fall to the ground.

Ver. 12. **After they heard this saying.**—"This remark is commonly referred to vers. 3-9. But we would rather apply it, with Euthym. Zigab., to ver. 11." Meyer. It is, indeed, quite true that it would have been impossible for them to have replied to vers. 3-9, while in answer to ver. 11 they might bring against Him the charge of subverting not only tradition, but even the written law. Still, their anger about His application to them of the prophecy of Isaiah must have increased their resentment and offence at His *λόγοι*. Nor must we here omit to observe the moral distinction between giving offence to the Pharisees and to the least of the disciples.

Ver. 13. **Every plant.**—Referring to the *teaching* and the *traditions* of the Pharisees (Ewald, Meyer, etc.), not to their persons (Fritzsche, Olshausen, de Wette). At the same time, we should also bear in mind what was said in Matt. xiii. about the identification of individuals with the doctrines which they professed.

Ver. 14. **Into the ditch.**—The cistern. Meyer supposes that the expression refers to *Gehenna*, implying that they were hopelessly lost. But, in our opinion, it primarily applies to historical and national, not to personal judgments. We infer this from the fact, that both classes of the blind are said to fall into the ditch,—those who feel their need of being guided (or the people), as well as those who

* [The *aposiopesis* is clear in the parallel passage of Mark vii. 11, after *κορβᾶν*, but he omits the second clause altogether, viz. the words: (*καὶ*) *οὐ μὴ τιμήσει* (*τιμήσῃ*), which create the only difficulty in our case.—P. S.]

† [This is inconsistent with the preceding remark that the Saviour was unwilling to draw or to state the conclusion of the Pharisees.—P. S.]

think they see, and assume to be leaders (*see* John ix.). The difference between them, however, was very great; and with reference to the Jewish people, comp. Rom. ix.-xi.

Ver. 15. **Peter.**—Acting as the representative of all the disciples; see Mark vii. 17.—**This parable.**—The whole discourse was parabolical, but sufficiently explained by the context, and not, as Peter seems to have supposed, a separate parable in the more limited sense of the term. It appears as if Peter had felt it difficult to distinguish between the symbol and the reality. Jesus had employed the physical as an emblem of the moral mouth, and in that particular His statement might be regarded as parabolical. But even in that respect the parabolical form had not been strictly carried out.

Ver. 17. **Do not ye understand?**—The place where the bodily functions are finally purified, is that where they terminate, ὁ ἀφεδρών (which, according to Suidas, designates both *anum* and *sellam; derivatur enim* ἀπὸ τῶν ἑδρῶν. The term is evidently related to ἄφεδρος, by which the *Sept.* render the place where menstruous women underwent purification). But that which constitutes the true nature of man can only be cleansed if the *heart*, whence words and actions issue, is purified. And this is the only true purity, contrasted with which all symbolical purifications are of no value. (*See* above, the antithesis between mercy and sacrifice.) A symbol becomes null and void if applied against the truth which it had been intended to present to the mind. In that case its real object is lost, and it does harm instead of good. Compare here Mark.

Ver. 19. **For out of the heart proceed.**—The Saviour implies that evil works first pass through the channel of an evil mouth, thus disclosing the evil state of the heart.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. As the Gospel history unfolds, the gulf between the believing and the unbelieving portion of the people becomes wider. If the former would fain touch the hem of His garment in order to be restored, the latter excommunicate Him, because His disciples had offended against their traditions.

2. Let us mark the progressive hostility against the Lord. First the Pharisees of Judea, then they of Galilee, had pronounced against Him; while both are now combined against Him and His word. The expression, "the Pharisees and scribes from Jerusalem," clearly implies that they were a deputation from the synagogue, representing the whole body of the Pharisees and scribes.

3. No doubt the peculiar arrangement adopted by Matthew was intended to indicate this state of matters. Hence the description of Christ's conflict with the secular authorities is followed by that of the assaults on the part of the Pharisees and scribes.

4. The increasing bitterness of His enemies appears also from the circumstance, that they now charged Him, in presence of the people, with setting at nought popular traditions. They evidently seem to have regarded the conduct of the disciples as reflecting the teaching of their Master. Hence the Lord feels called upon to set before the people the contrast between self-righteous traditionalism and the eternal commandments of God. This He illustrates in connection with the first and most special law of humanity. But the principle here laid down embraces a far wider range. It condemns all dead traditionalism which is inconsistent with life, and indeed every ecclesiastical ordinance which in spirit or in form is incompatible with the fundamental principles of our humanity, with the institutions of God, or with the demands of our moral nature.

5. The mere traditions of men are plants which our Father in heaven has not planted. They have sprung from temporal motives, were subservient to temporal interests, and became a temporal curse to those who blindly followed them. Hence also they shall at last meet with an earthly fate, and be rooted up. According to Heubner, the future tense, here used, must be regarded as implying that a certain thing must necessarily be done. But although it is quite true that Christ by His word roots up the principle of tradition in His Church, yet the actual process of uprooting will take place in the course of those judgments which the progress of history shall evolve. Comp. 1 Cor. iii. 13.

6. The antithesis between the mouth in the physical and in the moral sense involved a principle by which all the ordinances concerning meats were removed, in view of and as fulfilled by the law of the spirit. This, indeed, was the main ground of offence to the Pharisees. However, it was not the intention of the Lord to annul on this occasion these ordinances, as little as He meant to enjoin the cessation of sacrifices when He quoted the saying of the prophet, "I will have mercy, and not sacrifice." In the present instance also, a reference to the Hebrew expression would exhibit the right relationship between what was material and what immaterial (which had been perverted by hypocrisy), implying, as it did, that the latter was of no importance, and even contemptible, when contrasted with what in itself was material. On the symbolical import of these ordinances comp. the well known works on Old Testament Symbolism [by Bähr, Kurtz, Fairbairn], and the article *Reinigkeit* in Winer's Bibl. Encycl. The religious lustrations prescribed in the law gave rise to the pharisaical ordinances concerning the washing of hands before meals. In His teaching the Lord goes back upon the fundamental principle of all lustrations, laying peculiar stress on the antithesis between what was external and what was internal, since the Pharisees were in danger of substituting what was intended as a symbol, for the reality to which it pointed.

7. The words of Jesus may be regarded both as a doctrinal and as a controversial statement. The charge of the Pharisees implied that He and His disciples were a company of defiled sinners. Our Lord retorts by showing that defilement really attached to the Pharisees, not in any outward sense, but by the wicked thoughts issuing from their hearts. The doctrine, that out of the heart come evil thoughts, is not inconsistent with the dogma concerning the devil, since Satan can only tempt man, not produce sin in him. Comp. James i. 14.

8. The moment when Christ turns from the rulers of the synagogue to address Himself to the people, is both highly significant in itself and typical. The same may be said of the fact, that immediately afterward He passed for the first time beyond the boundary of the Holy Land; not, indeed, directly into the coast of Tyre, although soon afterward into the territory of Sidon. "Perhaps He found it necessary to impress upon the disciples, who as yet could not fully receive the contrast between Pharisaism and the religion of the Spirit, that the curse of defilement

hung over the Holy Land." Similarly, Elijah, when he could no longer find a habitation in Judea, had passed into Phœnicia, and even tarried there for a time.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The welcome and the ban which awaited the Lord on His return into His own country.—The secret landing of the Lord anon a public event.—The secret arrival of Christ a blessed event for the poor and needy who trusted in Him.—How the Pharisees and scribes would have shut up the way of the Lord: 1. Opposing their human authority to His divine mission; 2. their vain scholastic questions to His heavenly revelation; 3. the objections of their traditionalism to His proclamation of mercy; 4. their miserable pretensions to His blessed reality; 5. their thoughts of death to His way of life.—Sad decay of the once glorious synagogue.—The small masters in the presence of the great Master. 1. They call on Him, who is the Judge and Saviour of the world, to rebuke His disciples; 2. to wash that hand which restores life and health; 3. to purify that mouth whose word and breath sanctify the world; 4. to hallow the meal of Him who is the bread of life.—The *traditionalism of the elders* in its antagonism to *the law of the Eternal One:* 1. By a perversion of the law it dares to prefer charges against Him who is the personal law; 2. by its traditions it renders vain even the eternal commandments of God; 3. under the mask of sanctity it dares to condemn everlasting righteousness itself.—Inseparable connection between zeal for traditions and hypocrisy.—How the Lord brings to nought the plans of these zealots: 1. By replying to them, (*a*) throwing light on their doctrine; (*b*) on their character; 2. by turning from them, (*a*) giving liberty to the people by the word of liberty; (*b*) giving liberty to His own disciples by the call of liberty: "Let them alone."—Hypocrisy in its historical development: 1. What forms it assumed at the time of Isaiah; 2. at the time of Christ; 3. in our own days. —The unprofitableness and the judgments of hypocrisy: 1. It is a spurious service of the lips; 2. it is a vain and external service of the temple; 3. it is the vain service of the schools (unreal in the family, in the church, in the school, and in the state).—Let us meet the hypocrisy of officialism by imitating the example of the Lord and turning to the people.—The teaching of the Pharisees, and the doctrine of the Lord. 1. The former exalt what is sensuous above that which is spiritual, the external (as, for example, washings, fasts, prayers, almsgiving, etc.) above the internal; while Jesus sanctifies what is external by that which is internal. 2. The Pharisees convert the emblem into the reality, and thereby destroy it; while Jesus merges in and fulfils the symbol by the reality.—The offence of the Pharisees.—Objections to traditionalism: 1. It wants a divine origin. It has not its root in truth or in life, and hence has neither divine authority nor divine efficacy. It will give way before divine institutions (it is rooted up); it must give way before spiritual civilization, like heathenism, or like primeval forests.—"Let them alone" (ver. 13), or justification of the Reformation by the mouth of the Lord.—The blind leaders of the blind. 1. What they have in common: (*a*) Their guilt; (*b*) their ultimate fate. 2. Wherein they differ: the blind leaders are responsible both for themselves and for those whom they mislead; but, on the other hand, it is equally sinful on the part of the blind to allow themselves to be led by blind leaders.—The fall into the ditch.—"Do not ye yet understand, that *whatsoever* entereth into the mouth," etc.?—Terrible import of these words of the Lord in regard to those who pass moral judgments upon points connected with merely outward observances. —Even the mouth must be regarded as sacred to the Lord, and what it partakes becomes a spiritual feast, but only from its connection with, and dependence upon, the state of the heart.—If we seek purity in external things, our purification, being of the earth, will pass away.—That which proceedeth out of the mouth cometh forth from the heart.—Keep thy heart with all diligence, for out of it are the issues of life, Prov. iv. 23.—The deeds of the heart manifesting themselves by the words of the mouth.—Whatever cleaves to and defaces an object contrary to its purpose, defiles it; hence the defilement of sin.—The progress of that defilement which separates between the Lord and us: 1. Evil distinctions (exaltation of the outward over the inward); 2. adulteries (apostasy from the living God); 3. fornications (with the world and its pomp); 4. thefts (what is holy is taken from the Lord and given to the world); 5. false witnesses (lying accusations against what is holy); 6. blasphemies (see Matt. xii.).—What defileth a man before God: 1. Wherein defilement consisteth; 2. how it is contracted.—How eternal purity answered the charge of defilement brought against it by impure sinners.—How the wondrous beauty, purity, and delicacy of the emblem may be perverted into impurity, if it is set up in opposition to the reality which it was intended to foreshadow.

Starke:—*Nov. Bibl. Tub.*: Those self-conceited hypocrites who boast of being the Church, are generally the worst enemies and persecutors of the kingdom of Christ. Full of impurity themselves, they represent as sin what is not sin, and spy out the liberty of Christians, Gal. ii. 4; 2 Tim. iii. 5.—What a shame that the name of God should be used as a pretext to cover ambition and covetousness! This the false church has always done.—*Quesnel:* A desire for new inventions, and love for old errors and superstitions, are the fruitful source whence the disturbances of the Church spring, 1 Tim. i. 4-7.—*Cramer:* This is the mark of all hypocrites and sanctimonious persons, that they treat as a matter of conscience things indifferent, while they deal lightly with things of which they *should* make a matter of conscience.—Woe to children who would rather see the back than the face of their parents, who would rather commit them to the grave than support them!—*Quesnel:* It is sacrilegious to devote to God what should have been given in fulfilment of duties to which the instincts of nature and the law of God equally point.—*Hedinger:* Beware of sanctimonious people: they deceive the simple, but are ignorant of Christ.—Nothing is to be refused if it be received with thanksgiving, 1 Tim. iv. 4.—An unwashen mouth.—The heart in its natural state a poisonous fountain of evil thoughts.—Every plant, etc., 1 Cor. iii. 12.—It is quite possible to be spiritually blind while possessing accurate knowledge of the letter and even outward learning, Isa. lvi. 10. —*Nov. Bibl. Tub.:* That which is external can neither defile nor sanctify what is within, but the mind and heart sanctify or defile the outward deed. —*Gossner:* Lying traditions are turned into truth, and the Word of God and the truth of Christ are condemned as lies and heresies.—God desires above all the heart.—Look to your plants. What does not proceed from God. is not tolerated by God.—Preach

ers and hearers often lie in the same ditch of ignorance, worldliness, and pharisaical self-righteousness.

Lisco:—It is characteristic of a false faith to exalt the traditions of men above the commandments of God.—*Gerlach*:—It is characteristic of sin that it cannot remain quiescent, but must manifest itself outwardly, and thereby be completed.—A high reputation before men, and the applause of our cotemporaries, are of no avail in the kingdom of God if the new birth be wanting.—That which is external remains such, even though a man have received it internally.

Heubner:—Genuine and spurious purity.—The false teachers calling the heavenly Master to account. —They accuse Him of instilling into His disciples erroneous and dangerous principles.—Let us not be astonished when we see the most vain and heartless persons arrogating to themselves the post of leaders in religious matters.—Custom has frequently the most pernicious authority, and proves a fetter to the truth.—Immense difference between the traditions of men and the commandments of God.—Outward religious claims can never come into conflict with those of love.—None could have been further removed from a religion without love and righteousness than Christ.—Any religious or ecclesiastical usage which proves inconsistent with the law of love is an abomination unto Him.—The words of the prophets always true.—The human heart the same at different periods of time.—Man has a natural tendency to hypocrisy. —How careful are we to be outwardly pure, regardless of the state of matters within!—To follow Jesus, we must be free from all human authority.—The heart of man, which ought to be a temple of the Holy Spirit, naturally the dwelling-place of all abominations.

---

2. *Christ's Journey into the Heathen Coasts of Tyre and Sidon, and the Woman of Canaan.* Ch. XV. 21-28.

(The Gospel for *Reminiscere*.)

21 Then Jesus went thence,[1] and departed [withdrew, ἀνεχώρησεν] into the coasts [re-
22 gions] of Tyre and Sidon. And, behold, a woman of Canaan came out of the same
coasts, and cried unto him, saying, Have mercy on me, O Lord, *thou* Son of David;
23 my daughter is grievously vexed with a devil [κακῶς δαιμονίζεται]. But he answered
her not a word. And his disciples came and besought him, saying, Send her away
24 [dismiss her][2]; for she crieth after us. But he answered and said, I am not sent but
25 unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel. Then came she and worshipped him, saying,
26 Lord, help me. But he answered and said, It is not meet[3] to take the children's bread,
27 and to cast *it* to [little] dogs. And she said, Truth [Yea, Ναί], Lord: yet [for even][4]
28 the [little] dogs[5] eat of the crumbs which fall from their master's table. Then Jesus
answered and said unto her, O woman, great *is* thy faith: be it [done, γενηθήτω] unto
thee even[6] as thou wilt. And her daughter was made whole from that very hour.

[1] Ver. 21.—[Lit.: *went forth from thence* (ἐξελθὼν ἐκεῖθεν); Lange: *ging aus von dort*.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 23.—[Lange translates ἀπόλυσον αὐτήν: *finde sie ab*, either by granting or refusing her request; Campbell, Norton, Conant, Alford: *dismiss her*. So also Meyer: *entlasse sie*, viz., by granting her request, which is implied in the answer of Christ, ver. 24.—P. S.]

[3] Ver. 26.—Fritzsche, Lachmann, Tischendorf, [Alford] read: οὐκ ἔξεστι, following D. and some versions and fathers [instead of the *text. rec.* οὐκ ἔστι καλόν, *it is not good*, or *proper*]. A false interpretation. [Meyer derives the received reading from Mark vii. 27, and prefers οὐκ ἔξεστι, *es ist nicht erlaubt, it is not lawful, it is wrong*. Lange retains the received reading and translates καλόν: *fein*. Codd. Alex., Vatic., and Sinait. sustain the *text. rec.*: οὐκ ἔστι καλόν.—P. S.]

[4] Ver. 27.—[Καὶ γάρ cannot mean *yet* (Luther: *aber doch*; Campbell: *yet even*), which denotes opposition, and would qualify the preceding affirmative: *Yea*, but *for also*, *nam etiam*, or *nam et* (Lat. Vulgate), *denn auch* (Lange), by which the woman supports her assent to the Saviour's assertion and turns it to her own account. Alford: "The sense of καὶ γάρ is not given by '*yet*' in the E. V. The woman, in her humility, *accepts* the appellation which our Lord gives her, and *grounds her plea upon an inference from it*. . . . Our Lord, in the use of the familiar diminutive [κυνάρια], has expressed not the *uncleanness* of the dog, so much as his *attachment to and dependence on the human family*; she lays hold on this favorable point, and makes it her own, 'if we are dogs, then may we fare as such;—be fed with the crumbs of Thy mercy.' She was, as it were, under the edge of the table—close on the confines of Israel's feast." Comp. also Lange's Exeg. Note.—P. S.]

[5] Ver. 27.—[Lit. here and in ver. 26: *little* dogs, κυνάρια; Vulg.: *catelli*; Luther and Lange: *Hündlein*. The Lord purposely softened the harsh term, and caused his mercy to shine through the Jewish contempt of the heathen. Comp. *Exeg. Notes*.—P. S.]

[6] Ver. 28.—[*Even* is an unnecessary insertion of the E. V.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 21. **The journey of Jesus through the regions of Tyre and Sidon.**—The representatives of the Pharisees and scribes at Jerusalem had not merely accused the Lord of transgressing the traditions, but also indirectly declared Him defiled, or profane, because in the circle of His disciples He had omitted the washing of hands. To this charge Jesus had replied, by convincing them of their own moral defilement, contracted by their words and

thoughts. The interview had ended in their taking offence, which, of course, implied that Jesus was now to be formally accused of heresy. Accordingly, as previously in Judea, so now in Galilee, He could no longer show Himself openly without being exposed to their murderous plans. But His decease was to be accomplished at Jerusalem. Hence He **withdrew** from Galilee (ἀνεχώρησεν). It was as if He were driven into the boundary lands of heathenism by His horror of Jewish hypocrisy, as well as by way of precaution against their designs. In the first place He passed northwest through the mountains of Upper Galilee, and into the border land of Phœnicia. Hence He literally went εἰς τὰ μέρη, and not merely in that direction (Grotius, Bengel). But, according to ver. 22, He only touched the heathen boundary line (Kuinoel, Vatablus, Meyer). From Mark vii. 24 we infer that He had wished to continue there for some time in retirement, probably to prepare for further public movements. Thus He had, so to speak, been again driven to the very limits of human society, just as at His birth, on entering upon His office, and again at last on Golgotha. The Jewish world was closed against Him; nor had the hour yet come when the heathen world would be open to His word, the wall of separation not having yet been broken down by His death. For a season, Jesus seems hemmed up in the narrow border land between Canaan and Phœnicia, there to meditate in deep solitude upon His further movements. But He could not remain unknown. The healing of the Syrophenician woman's daughter, who had discovered His presence in those parts, spread His fame. He now travelled northward through the territory of Sidon (Lachmann and Tischendorf read διὰ Σιδῶνος in Mark vii. 31, after B., D., L.), and came to the foot of Mount Lebanon. Thence He passed (Mark vii. 31) through the boundary land of Decapolis (*i. e.*, the northern districts of the Decapolis, which according to Pliny included Damascus; according to Lightfoot, only Cesarea Philippi). Thus the Lord again arrived at the eastern shore of the Sea of Galilee. "As Jesus passed through the territory of Sidon from north to south, to return to the Sea of Galilee through the boundary districts of the Decapolis, He must have described a semicircle, passing through the mountain solitudes and valleys at the foot of Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon, and close by the snow-capped top of Hermon. Under a deep sense of having been driven from His own country, He travelled through the solitudes of that district, His mind already engaged with the decease which He was to accomplish." (*Leben Jesu*, ii. 2, 870.)

Ver. 22. **And, behold, a woman of Canaan.**—Χαναναία, a *Phœnician.* "During the earliest times of Jewish history, several tribes of Canaanites, כְּנַעֲנִי, who were the original inhabitants of Palestine, had retired northward before the Israelites. From these the Phœnicians were descended. *See* Reland, *Palestina*, pp. 7, 50; Winer, *Real-Wörterbuch;* Lightfoot, *in loc.*" Meyer. Further particulars are given in the Gospel of Mark.—**Came out.**—From the territory beyond to the place where Christ was.—**(Thou) Son of David.**—The Messianic hopes of the Jews were well known. Besides, we conclude that the woman had somehow been informed that the Son of David, or the Messiah, was at hand. She believed, although from ver. 26 it appears that she was not a proselyte of the gate, and the genuineness and spirituality of her faith required to be tried.—**Have mercy on me.**—Bengel: *Suam fecerat pia mater miseriam filiæ.* Of course, the heathens would share the Jewish belief in demoniacal possessions.

Ver. 23. **Dismiss her.**—Or, "have done with her," as we might render the sense of ἀπόλυσον αὐτήν—leaving it indefinite whether this was to be accomplished by fulfilling or by refusing her request. The former, however, is more likely; for the answer of Jesus shows that the disciples had interceded on behalf of the woman. [Alford: "The word ἀπόλυσον does not necessarily imply *granting* her request, nor the contrary; but simply, *dismiss her*, leaving the method to our Lord Himself." But Jesus, who penetrated into the heart of the disciples, interprets their request as an intercession in behalf of the poor woman (ver. 24), which agrees better, also, with their natural sympathy and charity.—P. S.]

Ver. 24. **I am not sent but to the lost sheep of the house of Israel.**—The question has been urged, whether this statement implied a positive or a hypothetical refusal of the woman's petition. Hase, de Wette, Stier, Ewald, and Meyer, hold that it was intended as a real refusal, which afterward, however, *was overcome* by the firm trustfulness of the woman. But what meaning do these commentators attach to the term *overcome?* Jesus could only be overcome as God Himself is overcome. In other words, for the sake of magnifying the office of faith, He allows the *trial* of our faith to assume the form of a *conflict.* On the other hand, it cannot have been His sole aim to try the faith of the woman (Chrysostom and others). If this were the case, the reply of Christ would still remain unexplained. In our view, the faith of the woman was tried in order to show that she really was a spiritual daughter of Abraham; in which case she would in truth be reckoned one of the lost sheep of the house of Israel. Possibly she might have attached only heathen ideas to the expression, *Son of David*, when her faith would merely have been superstition. This would become manifest, if, on trial, the spiritual elements were found to be wanting, viz., *perseverance, humility, reflection*, and *confidence.* In these respects the faith of the woman was now to be tried and proved. Such a test would show to the disciples that she really was a spiritual daughter of Israel. For, while showing mercy to those who were susceptible among the heathen, the Lord would not give offence to His own people in Israel. Hence it was necessary to prepare the disciples themselves to receive the woman into their fellowship. The same principle also regulated the progress of the Church subsequent to the feast of Pentecost. It is a summary solution of the question to say, that before Pentecost only Jews had been received, and afterward heathens also. If the heathens who were now received wanted outward circumcision, they had undergone the circumcision of the heart (Rom. ii.). Only as belonging to the spiritual Israel could they share in the salvation of Israel; and the believing Jews themselves were constrained to acknowledge that they had part with them (Acts x. xi.), having previously been taught that they themselves were the true Israel, only under the same conditions of faith and circumcision of the heart. Thus the narrative of the text prefigures the future enlargement of the Church, and the reception of the heathen into it. And this at the right moment—when, on the one hand, the conduct of Israel had driven the Lord into the border land of heathenism; while, on the other, the anticipation of the ingathering of the heathen would elevate Him above

the sorrow which weighed upon Him. But such individual instances of mercy shown to the heathen before the death of Christ, differ from the general call addressed to them after His decease, in that, in the former case, those who obtained mercy had become, so to speak, believing Israelites—owning the privileges of the chosen race and the validity of their law—while by the death of Christ the law itself was fulfilled, and therefore abolished, so far as its outward form was concerned.

Ver. 26. **It is not meet,** or **proper.**—The reading **it is not lawful,** is evidently a gloss or interpretation. Such a reply would have removed all doubt, and cut off every hope; while the expression actually used allows the law of the spirit to shine through that of the letter. At first sight it might appear as if Jesus Himself designated this order of things "*ex publico Judæorum affectu*" (Erasmus). But a closer examination shows that this was not the case. For, while the Jews were wont to designate the heathen as *dogs* (Lightfoot, Suicer, Wetstein, Eisenmenger, *Entdecktes Judenthum*, 713), they are in the text only called *κυνάρια*, not *κύνες*; implying that they were not like the great wild dogs which in the East infested towns and villages, but that they might be compared to small dogs attached to households (in Luke xvi. 21, however, the word *κύνες* is used). This apparently slight distinction forms the basis of the woman's reply. Besides, the antithesis—"to take the bread from the children and to give it to little dogs"—would serve to show the *humane motive* prompting the seemingly inhumane conduct—the Christian spirit under the Jewish guise, and to convince the woman that the question was not to be decided by any ordinance of traditionalism, but by the law of the spirit.

Ver. 27. **Yea, Lord.**—The word *ναί* by way of admission, not of contradiction; but not exclusively, or even primarily, referring to the designation "*little dogs.*" To have done so would have been to miss the meaning of Christ, although He had, no doubt, also intended to set before her mind the defilement clinging to her as a heathen. She acquiesces in *the truth of the whole statement*, humbly submitting to the judgment implied in the figure employed—that she had no right or title to the covenant-dispensation. But adopting this very figure (not with ἀλλά, as Chrysostom, Luther, [and our authorized version] have it, but with *καὶ γάρ*), she converts it into an argument. Yea, Lord—she says—it is even so: it is not meet to give the children's bread to the little dogs; but, on the contrary, the little dogs are sustained by what is left over from the superabundance on their master's table. De Wette interprets: "For dogs must be content with the crumbs which fall from their master's table." The meaning of her reply seems to be: Even so, Lord; for it is not customary for the children to suffer want in order that the little dogs may be fed, but rather that the latter are sustained by the crumbs which fall from the table.* Viewed in this light, the reply is most becoming, indicating: 1. *Humility*, or submission to a figure which apparently involved shame and, as understood by the Jews, reproach. 2. *Perseverance*, transforming a seeming refusal into an implied promise of help. 3. *Spirituality*, recognizing under the repulsive garb of the figure, the mind of Christ, whose love and benevolence she realized even through the unpromising medium. Evidently she beheld the rich fulness of Christ and of His kingdom. 4. *Confidence*, that the goodness and grace of the Lord were unlimited and illimitable.

Ver. 28. **O woman, great is thy faith.**—Thus showing that, in the one main point, she was one of the lost sheep of the house of Israel.

From that very hour.—*See* ch. ix. 22; John iv. 53. An instance of healing at a distance, as in ch. viii. 13; John iv. The intermediate link in this case was the heart of the mother, so closely knit to that of her daughter; as in the other two instances it had been the paternal affection of the royal officer, and the deep faith of the centurion at Capernaum.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. Christ banished as impure from the Holy Land, and passing through heathen countries. Historical parallels: Elijah, Paul.

2. The conduct of Christ in this case was occasioned by His twofold desire of influencing His disciples, as well as trying the faith of the woman. When her deep trustfulness became apparent, it must at the same time have evoked in the disciples the conviction that she was a genuine daughter of Abraham. It was not, and could not be, the intention of the Saviour to form a new communion of believing heathens by sweeping away the old communion of believing Israelites. Thus the event here recorded was not an exception to His ordinary dealings, but rather a symbolical directory which afterward guided the conduct of the Apostles; comp. Acts x. xi., and the journeys of Paul to Jerusalem, with which each of his missionary expeditions terminated.

3. When modifying the Jewish prejudice to the effect of treating as *little* dogs, who are included in the economy of mercy, those whom the Jews would have excluded from it as mere dogs, our Lord expresses the theocratic contrast between Judaism and heathenism in such a manner as to enable the woman to urge it in support of her plea. As ordained by God, this contrast implied that salvation was to be communicated to the heathen through the spiritual training and preparation enjoyed by Israel. But this arrangement had been perverted by Jewish prejudice, and the heathen were represented as impure dogs who had no part in the divine economy, and were excluded from the hope of salvation. Christ rectified this error by transforming the term of reproach employed by prejudice into a parable. It is not meet to take the bread from the children of the house, and to give it in the first place to the little dogs. Not that He implied that the house was poor, but that the time for the little dogs had not yet arrived. And such, indeed, was the general rule. But in her spiritual wisdom the woman took up the other aspect of the figure. The house and the table—she urged—are both full, and even during the meal crumbs fall to the ground. These may surely be eaten by the little dogs. Thus, while acknowledging the arrangements of the Old Testament economy,

* [So also Wordsworth: "*Yea*, Lord, Thou sayest true, it is not right to take the children's *bread* and *give* it to the dogs: *for* the dogs eat of the *crumbs* that *fall* from their master's table. Let me therefore have not bread, but only *crumbs*; and do not *give* me even them, but let me pick up what *falls* from the table. A beautiful image of the humility of the faithful Gentiles, hungering and thirsting for the least fragments of the gospel which dropped from the table of the Jews who despised it." Comp. Alford's explanation quoted above.—P. S.]

she exalted the fulness of Christ, which far exceeds all limitations.

4. On the miraculous cures at a distance, comp. my *Leben Jesu*, ii. 1, 275. These mysterious communings of mind form, so to speak, the basis for gracious blessings granted in answer to intercessory prayer.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The journey of Jesus through heathen territory an implied injunction of missionary labor.—As Judaism gradually closed, the heathen world commenced to open to the gospel.—The new place of retreat of the Lord.—The sorrows and joys of the Lord on this journey.—How the worldly-mindedness of His professing people always drove Him anew into the wilderness: 1. In His infancy; 2. after His baptism; 3. in the midst of His activity; 4. before His last sufferings; 5. at His ascension.—Elijah and the widow of Sarepta (1 Kings xvii. 9); Jesus and the woman of Canaan.—The woman of Canaan; or, successful prayer: 1. So earnest; 2. so believing; 3. so humble; 4. so wise; 5. so instant and persevering; and hence, 6. with such glorious results.—Boldness of this petitioner: 1. She cried *after Him;* 2. she fell down *before Him.*—Greatness of the trial to which the Lord subjected her faith: 1. Her difficulties: (*a*) He answered her not a word; (*b*) He appeared to refuse her request,—"I am not sent," etc.; (*c*) He gave her a seemingly harsh reply: "It is not meet," etc. 2. Yet there was hope for her: (*a*) He gave not a positive refusal, or did not turn from her; (*b*) He spoke of the lost sheep, or reasoned with her; (*c*) He only said that the little dogs were not to be fed if it deprived the children of their bread, or He put a plea into her mouth.—How it must clearly appear that ours is genuine faith, and not superstition, if we are to have part in the salvation of Israel.—How even the heathen may, in the sight of the Lord, belong to the lost sheep of the house of Israel.—How the Lord trains His disciples to be apostles to the heathen.—Shortcomings in the intercession of the disciples: 1. Their motive was good (the woman required help, and the Lord was able to grant it); 2. their arguments were insufficient (they were molested by her cries); 3. but even these insufficient arguments indicated the presence of love and compassion (the cry of a heathen went to their heart, and they forgot their Jewish prejudices).—It is impossible to continue cherishing fanaticism if we but rightly understand the cry of the human heart for help.—Why the Lord would have the disciples receive the woman into their communion.—Let us not go forth to the heathen attempting to win souls for a particular sect at home.—Exclamation of astonishment about the faith of this poor heathen.—Glorious declaration, "Be it done to thee even as thou wilt."—The greatness of her faith consisted in great humility, great trustfulness, and great ardor, notwithstanding a very small measure of knowledge.—Maternal love and faith here combined.—Thus the Lord showed Himself victorious over the devils even among the heathen.—Intercession as opening up the heathen world to Christ.—How the longing of the world and the compassion of the Church meet and combine at the footstool of Jesus.

Starke:—Canstein: God withdraws His gracious presence from those who are weary of it, and who despise His word and benefits: Acts xiii. 46; Hosea v. 15.—If we listen to the doctrine of men, we shall lose sight of Christ, Gal. v. 4.—*Zeisius:* It is the gracious will of God that even the heathen should be gathered into the kingdom of Christ, Isa. xlii. 6; xlix. 6.—*Hedinger:* God frequently exercises His people by manifold trials; He even appears to be cruel in delaying His aid, in order to draw out their prayers and to prove their faith.—*Canstein:* Even the tyranny of Satan must be subservient to the glory of the divine name.—Lo, how the cross drives people into the arms of our blessed Saviour!—O thou precious cross, how very needful and useful thou art!—Prosperity leads from Christ, but adversity brings to Him.—Parents should feel the misery of their children as deeply as their own; but the greatest of all afflictions is, if they are under the dominion of Satan, and do his works.—Parents should be concerned for the physical, and still more for the spiritual, well-being of their children.—*Canstein:* God is faithful, who adapts the measure of our temptations to that of the grace given us, 1 Cor. x. 13.—It is sinful to spend upon dogs or other animals that by which we ought to relieve men, who are the children of God.—We should not withhold even from animals their necessary sustenance.—*Osiander:* It is a grievous temptation to think that you are not one of Christ's sheep; still, continue to cleave implicitly to Christ, and you will overcome.—*Quesnel:* A genuine penitent will not be discouraged by the way in which God deals with him.—Faith will only increase, not decrease under trials, 1 Pet. i. 6, 7.—The Lord is near to all that call on Him, Ps. cxlv. 19.—Intercession, James v. 14, 15.—If we desire to receive from God what we ask, we must be content first to bear what God may be pleased to send, even though it were the greatest trial.—The prayers and the faith of parents bring down the richest blessing upon their children.

Gossner:—The Canaanites, once so corrupted that they had to be expelled from the Holy Land, lest the Jews might be ruined by their contact, were now in fact better than the Jews, and this woman left her home to meet Jesus.*—If we would show mercy, we should not be too hasty, but proceed cautiously.

Gerlach:—The woman of Canaan had heard little of Christ; but her faith shows how even small knowledge may produce great effects, if received into a humble and broken heart.—Analogous passages of Scripture: the parable of the unjust judge, Luke xviii. 3; the wrestling of Jacob, Gen. xxxii. 24; the distress of Moses, Ex. iv. 24; the cry of Jesus, Matt. xxvii. 46 (Ps. xxii.).—It is remarkable how, in a certain sense, this woman rectified the words of Jesus; but this arises from the nature of the thing.—The law, which accuses and condemns man, is removed by the grace which faith appropriates.

Heubner:—Expelled from His own country, Christ still remained faithful to it.—He often delayeth His answer, lest we should grow weary of calling upon Him, and that although the promise remaineth true, Isa. lxv. 24, "Before they call, I will answer; and while they are yet speaking, I will hear."—Let us not be tempted to treat the entreaties of any one as troublesome. *Res sacra miser.*—*Chrysostom:* Jesus fulfilled even the law which prohibited the Jews from having communion with the Canaanites (Deut. vii.; although it only applied to their idolatrous customs, comp. the life of Elijah), in order

* [This thought is borrowed from St. Chrysostom.—P. S.]

that He might be able to say, *Which of you convinceth me of sin?* John viii. 46.—A Christian combines love to his own country with affectionate interest in the world generally.—Import of the word "*nevertheless*," to which the Christian cleaves in pleading with God, Ps. lxxiii. 23-26.—*Truth, Lord; yet.**—The whole system of faith contained in these three words.—In one sense I have no claim upon Thee, yet in another I have.—Faith will stand the most searching and painful trial, and at last obtain the victory.—"Truth, Lord" (humility); yet (faith). —*Bengel:* Let us ever bear in mind that we are heathens.—We should be glad to receive the crumbs which fall from the table, instead of attempting to jump upon it, and even to upset it.—*Chrysostom:* "Great is thy faith:" thou hast not seen a single miracle; thou hast not heard any one of the prophets; thou hast not been trained in the law; thou hast been passed by and treated with contempt by Me. Still thou hast persevered; receive then the acknowledgment of thy faith.—Noble mother of Canaan! how many mothers has thy example encouraged!—Wisdom and grace of Jesus in His dealings with the woman of Canaan: 1. In drawing her; 2. in trying her; 3. in rewarding her.—The woman of

* [Assuming this rendering of the Authorized English Version, and the corresponding German Version of Luther (*aber doch*) to be correct, against which compare the *Exeg. Notes*.—P. S.]

Canaan a figure of the Christian wrestling in faith.—Faith and prayer are inseparable.

Reinhard:—On the connection between true humility before God and genuine confidence in Him.—*Mehliss:* Even when help is deferred our confidence should not fail.—*Bachmann:* The Lord the Author and the Finisher of our faith.—*Krabb* (of Langenberg): Jesus and the woman of Canaan; or, faith: 1. How it wrestles; 2. how it conquers.

[*Matthew Henry:*—Those whom Christ intends most signally to honor, He first humbles and lays low in a sense of their own meanness and unworthiness. We must first feel ourselves to be as dogs, *less than the least of all God's mercies*, before we are fit to be dignified and privileged with them.—Christ delights to exercise great faith with great trials, and sometimes reserves the sharpest for the last, that being tried, we may come forth like gold.—Special ordinances and church privileges are children's bread, and must not be prostituted to the grossly ignorant and profane. Common charity must be extended to all, but spiritual dignities are appropriated to the household of faith.—If we cannot *reason* down our unbelief, let us *pray* it down.—"Great is thy faith." The woman had many graces, wisdom, humility, meekness, patience, perseverance in prayer; but these were the fruits of her faith, which of all graces honors Christ most; therefore of all graces Christ honors faith most.—P. S.]

---

3. *The Second Miraculous Feeding.* CH. XV. 29-38.

29 And Jesus departed from thence, and came nigh unto the Sea of Galilee; and [he]
30 went up into a mountain, and sat down there. And great multitudes came unto him,
having with them *those that were* lame, blind, dumb, maimed,[1] and many others, and
31 cast them down at Jesus' [his] feet;[2] and he healed them: Insomuch [so] that the multitude [multitudes, τοὺς ὄχλους] wondered, when they saw the dumb to speak [speaking,
λαλοῦντας], the maimed to be whole [whole], the lame to walk [walking], and the blind
32 to see [seeing]: and they glorified the God of Israel. Then Jesus called his disciples
unto him, and said, I have compassion on the multitude, because they continue with me
now three days, and have nothing to eat: and I will not send them away fasting, lest
33 they faint in the way. And his disciples say unto him, Whence should we have so
34 much bread in the wilderness, as to fill so great a multitude? And Jesus saith unto
35 them, How many loaves have ye? And they said, Seven, and a few little fishes. And
36 he commanded the multitude [multitudes, ὄχλοις] to sit [lie] down on the ground. And
he took the seven loaves and the fishes, and gave thanks, and brake *them*, and gave to
37 his disciples, and the disciples to the multitude. And they did all eat [all ate], and
were filled: and they took up of the broken *meat* [of the fragments] that was [were]
38 left seven baskets full. And they that did eat [ate] were four thousand men, besides
women and children.

[1] Ver. 30.—The order in the enumeration of the sick varies in the critical authorities. The one followed in the text is supported by E., G., R., etc., Lachmann.

[2] Ver. 30.—[For the *text. rec.*: πόδας τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, all the critical editions read πόδας αὐτοῦ, *His feet*. So also Lange in his version.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 29. **From thence,**—*further on;* μεταβάς. *See* above.

And sat down there.—He must needs return to His people. Accordingly, after having passed round the sources of Jordan, He again arrived at the eastern shore of the sea, and sat down there, or settled on the mountain,—*i. e.*, continued His solitary communing in prayer. But He could not remain unknown.

Ver. 30.—The text here introduces a new description of sufferers, the κυλλοί, or **maimed in**

nands or feet. Perhaps the term may allude to *cretins*.—The people **cast them down at His feet,**—indicating, according to Bengel and Meyer, their haste; according to Fritzsche and de Wette, implicit confidence; and according to Baumgarten-Crusius, the helplessness of the persons who were afflicted. But may it not at the same time indicate both the rudeness of these mountaineers, and their confidence, boldness, and their rapid movements in order to bring to the feet of Jesus all who were diseased? Among these cures Mark specially instances that of a deaf and dumb person (vii. 32).

Ver. 31. **They glorified the God of Israel.**—These remote mountaineers knew little of the Messianic character of Jesus. Probably they had adopted many heathen notions, and were wont to compare other gods with the God of Israel. Hence they now glorified the God of Israel, in consequence of the miracles of Him whom they acknowledged as His prophet.

Ver. 32-38. **But Jesus called His disciples to Him.**—The case was much more *urgent* than on the former occasion. The multitude had followed Him from the mountains, and not, as formerly, gathered in preparation for the festival of Easter. For three days they had continued with Him, partly forgetful of the wants of nature. Such scanty provision as they had brought with them was consumed. There was no possibility of either going into neighboring towns, or quickly returning across the lake. They could only retire to their mountain homes through the passes by which they had followed Him. They might therefore readily faint by the way. Similarly, the case was one of much greater *difficulty* than formerly. The multitudes here collected were more ignorant of the extent of Christ's power. On the other hand, the supply of the disciples was somewhat larger—seven loaves and a few fishes; whilst the multitude was smaller, at least by a thousand men. These circumstances will explain why the disciples in their discouragement designated their fishes as ἰχθύδια, and why Christ here commanded (ἐκέλευσε) the multitude to sit down.

From the similarity of this narrative to that of the first feeding of the people, and from the evident perplexity of the disciples, Schleiermacher and others have erroneously inferred that Matthew had here a second time reported one and the same fact. Krabbe, Hoffmann, Ebrard, and others controvert this view. Meyer thinks that the two events were different; but that the narratives had, in the course of tradition, become more like each other than the facts themselves. But the difference between them appears even in the terms for the baskets (σπυρίδες, *baskets for provisions*) in which the fragments were gathered, and in the circumstance that there were *seven* of them. Meyer: "The seven baskets correspond to the number of the loaves; the twelve baskets to that of the Apostles." If it be asked why less was left over when the provision had been originally greater, and the number of guests smaller, we might, perhaps, in reply, point to the difference in the baskets. But if the twelve baskets implied that the Lord would make abundant provision for all the Apostles if they surrendered everything for Him, the seven baskets may indicate both that He would richly reward their sacrifices (seven baskets for seven loaves), and that their requirements were diminishing since their pilgrimage was nearing its end.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

As above in the account of the first feeding of the multitude, ch. xiv. 14-21.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

They cast those who were afflicted at Jesus' feet.—Cast all your care upon Him.—How the gracious help of the Lord should incite us to compassion.—Christ and His cures: 1. The variety of sufferings (the maimed also); 2. the rude attendants; 3. the Saviour always ready to help.—The repetition of the miraculous feeding of the multitude reminding us of the words of the Lord, "The poor ye have always with you."—Comparison between the two occasions on which the multitudes were fed: 1. The second occasion was seemingly less distinguished than the first (seven loaves, five loaves; five thousand, four thousand; twelve baskets, seven baskets). 2. In reality, it was greater. (On the first occasion the people knew Him well, while on the second they were ignorant mountaineers from the utmost boundaries of the land; on the first occasion the crowd was preparing to go up to the feast, while on the second it was gathered from the mountains; on the first occasion the miracle took place at the close of the first day, but on the second after they had continued for three days with Jesus.) Similarly, the results were different. (On the first occasion they would have made Him their king, while on the second they glorified the God of Israel.)—What lessons the Lord here imparts for Christian households. He teaches them: 1. Confidence in His own superabundant riches; 2. carefulness in the use of the blessings which He bestows on them.—Provision is always made for the women and children along with the men.—The circumstance that the women and children are not specially mentioned, implying a promise for their provision.

Starke: See how obtuse our reason is when we continue to harbor doubts and unbelief, although we have so many evidences of the power and goodness of our God, Num. xi. 18-23.—*Osiander*: When God bestows His blessing, that which seemeth little becometh much.—*Cramer*: Nature is satisfied with plain fare (bread and fishes).—To eat and be satisfied are always combined when God spreads the table for His children.—Carefulness turns everything to account.—*Quesnel*: The more liberally we employ the gifts of God in a manner pleasing to Him, the more abundantly shall we receive of them, Gal. vi. 9.—*Luther*: Let us frequently think of the great multitude of peoples who daily sit down at God's table, and are satisfied. This will help us to glorify the love and power of our God.—*Quesnel*: Let heads of houses rely upon the divine provision, however numerous their families, Ps. lv. 23.

Lisco:—Erroneously: "This event occurred near Magdala, a city by the Lake of Galilee."—*Gerlach*: Magdala, a city by the Lake of Galilee, not far from Gadara.—This mistake seems to have originated with Lightfoot and Wetstein.

Heubner:—The less the people thought about eating and drinking, the more did Christ care for their wants.—"Many children, many prayers."—Christ the spiritual Head of the house.—The Christian parent after the example of Christ.

D. CHRIST MANIFESTS HIMSELF AS THE HIGH PRIEST IN HIS SUFFERINGS;—BEING REJECTED BY THE PHARISEES AND SADDUCEES, OR BY THE COMBINED THEOCRATICAL AUTHORITIES OF GALILEE.

Chapter XV. 39–XVI. 12.

Contents:—Although the Lord landed privately on the western shore near Magdala, He was immediately met by His enemies. The combined authorities of the country now demand of Him to prove His claims to the Messianic title by showing that sign from heaven, which in their carnal expectations they connected with the appearance of the promised Deliverer. Their object evidently was to represent His probable refusal of their request as an acknowledgment of His being a false Messiah. Jesus dismisses them with a rebuke, in which He again points them to the sign of Jonah, *i. e.*, to His death and resurrection. Thus rejected in Galilee, He immediately returns across the sea to the eastern shore, there to prepare in retirement for His last journey to Jerusalem. The warning addressed to the disciples about the leaven of the Pharisees and scribes was intended to teach them that they were now to forsake Galilee, which had practically surrendered itself to heathenism, just as Moses and his people had left the land of Egypt.

---

1. *The Sign from Heaven.* Ch. XV. 39–XVI. 4.

Ch. XV. 39 And he sent away the multitude [multitudes, ὄχλους], and took ship [entered
into the ship],[1] and came into the coasts of Magdala [Magadan].[2]
Ch. XVI. 1 The Pharisees also with the Sadducees came,[3] and tempting, desired him
2 that he would shew [to show] them a sign from heaven. He answered and said unto
3 them, When it is evening, ye say, *It will be*[4] fair weather: for the sky is red. And in
the morning, *It will be* foul weather to day: for the sky is red and lowering. O *ye*
hypocrites,[5] ye can [ye know how to][6] discern the face of the sky; but can ye not *dis-*
4 *cern* the signs of the times? A wicked and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign;
and there shall no sign [and no sign shall] be given unto it, but the sign of the proph-
et[7] Jonas [Jonah]. And he left them, and departed.

[1] Ch. xv., ver. 39.—[Ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ πλοῖον.]

[2] Ver. 39.—[The authorities are divided between Μαγδαλάν, Μαγαδάν, and Μαγδαλά. The Vatican and the Sinaitic MSS. read Μαγαδάν, and so do Tischendorf, Lachmann, and Alford. Lange prefers Μαγδαλάν. *See* his Exeg. and Crit. Notes *in loc.*—P. S.]

[3] Ch. xvi., ver. 1.—[Better: *And the Pharisees and* (*the*) *Sadducees came*, Καὶ προσελθόντες οἱ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ (οἱ) Σαδδουκαῖοι.—P. S.]

[4] Ver. 2.—[The interpolation here and in ver. 3 is unnecessary. *Fair weather!* is more lively. So Ewald, Lange: *Schön Wetter!* Meyer: *Heiteres Wetter!* The Greek has only one word in each case, εὐδία (from εὖ and Διός, gen. of Ζεύς), *clear sky, fine weather*, and χειμών, *storm, rainy, foul weather.*—P. S.]

[5] Ver. 3.—Ὑποκριταί, *hypocrites*, is wanting in Codd. C., D., L., etc., and thrown out by Lachmann and Tischendorf. [Cod. Sinait. omits all the words from ὀψίας γενομένης to δύνασθε, ver. 2–3, probably by an oversight of the transcriber.—P. S.]

[6] Ver. 3.—[Γινώσκετε. So also Lange: *ihr versteht's*. The second *discern* (διακρίνειν) of the E. Vers. is an interpolation, but makes the sense clearer. The lit. rendering is: *Ye know* (γινώσκετε) *how to discern the face of the sky; but can ye not* (οὐ δύνασθε) *the signs of the times?* Lange gives τῶν καιρῶν an emphatic sense and translates: *die Zeichen der Entscheidungszeiten*, the decisive epochs, such as the one of Christ's ministry on earth.—P. S.]

[7] Ver. 4.—Τοῦ προφήτου is wanting in B., D., L., and erased by Lachmann and Tischendorf. [It is also omitted in the Codex from Mt. Sinai, and in the editions of Tregelles, and Alford. Lange retains it in his version, but in smaller type and in parenthesis.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

XV. 39.—**Into the coasts of Magdala [Magdalan, Magadan].**—The circumstance that Jesus secretly lands in an obscure and unknown place, throws considerable light on the degree of hostility and persecution which He had to encounter during His last journey in Galilee. The watchfulness of the Jewish leaders appears from this, that despite the precautions used by the Lord, they are seemingly ready immediately to meet Him, this time with a categorical demand.—Magdalan lay on the western shore of the lake. Probably it is the modern small village of *el Mejdel*, about an hour and a half to the north of Tiberias, and protected toward the sea by high cliffs (Robinson, ii. 397; Schubert, iii. 250). Robinson enumerates the various arguments against placing it on the eastern shore of the lake. In all likelihood the name of Mary *Magdalene* was derived from this place, which also gave birth to several of the Rabbins mentioned in the Talmud. According to Mark viii. 10, the landing took place in the district of Dalmanutha, probably a village not far from Magdalan. We conjecture that the Lord touched the shore somewhere between these two villages, and nearer to Dalmanutha than to Magdalan—the account in Mark being the more accurate, while Matthew only speaks of Magdalan, as being the place more generally known. Winer suggests that Magda-

lan was the מִגְדַּל אֵל of the Old Testament; Ewald, that it was Megiddo, which, however, according to Robinson, ii. 329, lay farther inland. The view of Ewald is based on the reading Μαγαδάν, in Codd. B., D., the Syriac version, etc. (which has been adopted by Lachmann and Tischendorf), and with which the reading Μαγεδάν (Vulg., Ital.) may be compared. But Codd. C., M., the Coptic translation, etc., read Μαγδαλάν. Now it is quite possible, either that this difference of reading may have originated from a desire to assimilate this name to that of a better known place, or else that Magada, the name of an obscure village on the lake, may have been converted into that of the well-known birthplace of Mary Magdalene.

XVI. 1. **And the Pharisees and (the) Sadducees.**—According to Strauss and de Wette, this is the same event as that recorded in ch. xii. 38. The remark is true, but only so far as the spirit, the tendency, and some of the external features, not so far as the peculiar characteristics, of the narrative are concerned. Evidently, it occurred at a later period of history; the place where the Saviour landed, the demand made upon Him, and His reply, are all different. Strauss and de Wette regard it as improbable that the Pharisees and Sadducees should have combined. And yet these two parties must have united in the Sanhedrin which condemned Jesus to death! Instead of such idle conjectures, it would have been well if critics had rather inquired how it came that the two parties even at this early period united in their hostility to the Saviour. That both the Pharisees and the Sadducees are introduced with the article,* implies that in this case they represented the hierarchical authorities of the country generally. In the former contest, the *Synagogue* alone had been represented, while now in all probability the *Sanhedrin* itself, in its official capacity, deals with Jesus. Hence also the express demand of a sign from heaven, which may be considered as the logical inference from the last interview between the Pharisees and Jesus. On that occasion, the Saviour had not only discarded the authority of traditionalism, but His statements might even be interpreted as implying superiority to the law itself. This they knew was equivalent to asserting His claims as the Messiah. Accordingly, they now gave full utterance to the idea which the Pharisees of Galilee had previously urged, though in a less distinct manner (ch. xii.), by demanding a sign from heaven. Withal, as Theophylact remarks, their request still implies the supposition that the miraculous cures performed by Him had been effected by the power of Beelzebul.

Tempting (πειράζοντες), or in order to tempt Him.—This does not necessarily imply the presupposition that He was really a false Messiah, and hence unable to show the sign from heaven. For, if He had acceded to their request, they would have been well satisfied with Him, and He would have been a Messiah according to their own mind, pledged to fulfil all their carnal hopes (*see* Matt. iv.) Repeatedly afterward did they utter their secret desire that it might even be so; nor does this hope seem to be wholly extinct even in the derisive taunt, "If He be the Son of God let Him come down from the cross." But these carnal hopes were already in great measure eclipsed by their unbelief and their hostility. Hence the primary object of this twofold temptation was to represent Jesus to the people as a spurious Messiah, who was unable to substantiate His claims.

A sign from heaven.—The same request had already been proffered by the Jews after He had driven from the temple those that bought and sold (John ii. 18); and His reply "Destroy this temple," etc., substantially conveyed the same meaning as the answer given on the occasion recorded in the text. A second demand to the same effect was made, according to John vi. 30, immediately after the first miraculous feeding of the multitude, or about the same time as the request mentioned in Matt. xii. 38; a proof that the artifice of entrapping Him by such a proposal was at the time further carried out. In the text, this demand is brought forward a third time, and now in most explicit language. This sign from heaven was popularly expected to be outwardly visible; such passages as Dan. vii. 13 being interpreted in a sensuous manner, and probably referred to some visible manifestation of the *Shechinah*. From the answer of Christ, in which the appearance of the clouds as a sign of the weather is subordinated to the signs of the spiritual world, we infer that the Pharisees and Sadducees shared the popular notions. The sign which they expected was, therefore, something purely external, belonging to a totally different sphere from the miraculous cures performed by Jesus. That the term ἐπερωτᾶν implies not merely questioning (as Fritzsche and Meyer suppose), but a formal demand, appears from the reply of Jesus: γενεά, κ.τ.λ., σημεῖον ἐπιζητεῖ, and from the meaning of ἠρώτων in ch. xv. 23. The reply of Jesus is entirely adapted to the character of the deputation. If on a former occasion He had convinced the deputation from the synagogue that they were wretched teachers of the law, He now shows that these rulers were equally indifferent politicians, *i.e.*, very superficial observers of the signs of the times. They knew how to prophesy the weather for the ensuing day, but not how to interpret the signs of the times.

Vers. 2 and 3. **When it is evening.**—*Curiosi erant admodum Judæi in observandis tempestatibus cœli et temperamento aëris.* Lightfoot. We would suggest that the Lord attached a symbolical meaning to what He said about the signs of the weather. The red at even of the Old Testament betokened fair weather at hand. Similarly, the red sky at the commencement of the New Testament indicated the storm about to descend upon Israel. But they were incapable of understanding either one or other of these signs.

Ver. 3. **The signs of the times.**—The plural τὰ σημεῖα τῶν καιρῶν is here used on account of the contrast of these two times. Beza, Kuinoel, and others, apply the expression to the miracles of Jesus; Grotius, to the fulfilment of Old Testament prophecies; Meyer and de Wette, to the Messianic hopes and views entertained by the people in connection with Jesus. But undoubtedly these signs of the times depended mainly on their own relationship and conduct toward the Lord, which really constituted the contrast between this evening and morning, or the contrast of these καιρῶν. Accordingly, we might apply the redness of the sky at evening to the activity of Christ, and the red and lowering sky in the morning to His sufferings on the cross. This would strictly accord with His sign of the prophet

* [The article before Σαδδουκαῖοι is omitted by Tischendorf, Lachmann, and Alford on the best authorities, which Dr. Lange must have overlooked.—P. S.]

Jonah. Besides, the reply of Jesus also involved the rebuke, that their views of the sign from heaven were entirely carnal and sensuous, applying only to the clouds and the outward sky; while the true sign from heaven consisted in the spiritual indications of the times. The circumstance that Jesus thus addressed the Pharisees and Sadducees before the people, seems to have been the reason why Luke records the event in a different connection (ch. xii. 54). Compare also the μὴ μετεωρίζεσθε of Luke xii. 29.

Ver. 4. **The sign of Jonah.**—This time without any further explanation; implying that their present demand was connected with the former request of the Pharisees (ch. xii.), and hence that they were already acquainted with His explanation of the sign of Jonah. As if He would say, I refer you to My former statement on this subject as sufficient and final.

And He left them.—This abrupt termination indicates that He judicially gave them up. Bengel: *Justa severitas.* Comp. ch. xv. 10; xxi. 17; xxii. 46; xxiv. 1. But the strongest evidence of this judicial surrender lies in the fact that Jesus at once passed to the eastern shore, and in His warning of the disciples against the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees. Manifestly Jesus now immediately returned with His disciples to the other side. (Comp. here Meyer against Fritzsche.)

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The demand of the Pharisees for a sign from heaven was certainly in itself no absurdity. But it depended upon an entire confusion of the first and the second advent of Christ. It is quite true that the prophecies on which they founded their views contained references to vast transformations in the world which would result from the completion of Christ's mission. But as the death and resurrection of Christ are related to the end of the world as the principle to the full development, or as the seed-corn to the ripe fruit, so also is the sign of Jonah (or Christ's death and resurrection) most definitely connected with those signs from heaven which shall usher in the final catastrophe. Indeed, strictly speaking, it is the sign from heaven *in principle* which by and by will also appear in the clouds of heaven (Matt. xxiv. 30).

2. *Ye know how to discern the face of the sky, but.*—Of course this statement does not imply that it was easier to interpret the signs of the spiritual world than those of the sky. But the former, and not the latter, was the calling and business of the Sanhedrin, while in reality they were better prophets of the weather than interpreters of those prophecies which it was their duty to expound. Besides, the statement also indicates that the signs of the sky are uncertain, and may deceive us; while moral signs, if properly understood, never mislead.

3. Mark relates that the Saviour sighed deeply in spirit when His enemies again met Him with this demand. He fully comprehended the decisive importance of that hour. Henceforth He could no longer tarry in Galilee—Galilee rejected Him. This holds even more true of Judea, whence these persecutions issued. The Master felt that now only a brief time of respite was left Him on the other side of Jordan, to prepare Himself and His intimate disciples for the decease at Jerusalem.

4. This was the third occasion on which Jesus was driven from Galilee, and passed over the lake into the mountains. The first time it was to avoid the court of Herod; the second time He retreated before the traditionalism of the schools; the third time before the hardened hierarchy of the whole country.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The demand of a sign from heaven; or, the old temptation under a new form. 1. The old temptation: (*a*) The proposal itself, to be a worldly Messiah, a Jewish conqueror, not a Saviour of nations; to overthrow the old world, not to renew the spiritual world by regeneration, and thereby to transform the external world. (*b*) Why a temptation? Because it was based upon elements of truth which were perverted into error. 2. The new form of this temptation. (*a*) It was under the guise of a sign from heaven; (*b*) partly an allurement and partly a threat, forming a transition from the temptations from the *pleasures* of the world (Matt. iv.) to those from its *sufferings* (Matt. xxvi.); (*c*) it was urged with the evident intention to represent the Lord to the people as a false Messiah, and thus to destroy His influence, even if He escaped their hands.—How the Jewish politicians, in their knowledge of the weather, overlooked the signs of the spiritual weather: (*a*) They lost the brightest day; (*b*) they encountered the severest storm.—The successors of the prophets sunk to the level of weather-prophets,—a warning example.—How even their superficial knowledge of nature would rise in testimony against their theology.—Why the Lord here calls them hypocrites? (*a*) Because they neglected and misunderstood those spiritual signs which it was their calling to interpret, while, on the other hand, they gave themselves to the interpretation of outward signs with which they had no business; (*b*) because in general they perverted their spiritual into a secular calling.—Outward calculations of things always end in this, that a man at last becomes slavishly dependent upon wind and weather.—How most men allow themselves to be so engrossed by the signs of the visible sky as to overlook what is going on in the spiritual sky.—The true signs of the time.—Signs at evening and in the morning in the kingdom of God.—Let us not be dependent on wind and weather, but look up to the Sun of righteousness.—Why no other sign than that of Jonah could be given to this evil and adulterous generation.—*He left them and departed;* or, the decisive hour: 1. His death was now decided upon; 2. their fall and judgment were now decided; 3. the grand course of events during the long-suffering of Christ, from His resurrection to His second advent, was now decided; 4. the future condition of the Church as sharing the fate of her banished and persecuted Lord was now decided; 5. the termination of the old things of this world by the final judgment was now decided.—*And He left them;* or, the silent commencement of a new era.—*He departed;* but they are still standing and waiting for the sign from heaven.

Starke:—The Pharisees and the Sadducees.—*Hedinger:* In any undertaking against Christ or His people, Pilate and Herod will always be ready to join hands, Luke xxiii. 12.—The enemies of Christ always repeat objections which have already been thoroughly answered and refuted.—Unbelief trusts God no

further than it can see with its eyes and feel with its hands; while true faith simply relies on the word of God, even though it sees neither signs nor miracles.—*Canstein:* Let us give heed to those times which God has marked by certain signs.—Woe to those from whom Jesus departs; who is to be their Saviour and Helper?

Gerlach:—If your vision were not at fault, you would descry miracles enough to satisfy you!

Heubner:—How fruitful is human wisdom in expedients for our earthly concerns, and how inexperienced and unskilful in divine things!—There are "signs of the times" in the kingdom of heaven.—These signs only a devout mind can read; the Spirit of God discloses the purposes of God.—A Christian and a spiritual policy.—Christ does not beg for applause.

---

2. *The Leaven.* CH. XVI. 5–12.

5 And when his disciples were come to the other side, they had forgotten to take
6 bread. Then Jesus said unto them, Take heed and beware of the leaven of the Phari-
7 sees and of the Sadducees [and S.].[1] And they reasoned among themselves, saying,
8 *It is* because we have taken [we took, ἐλάβομεν] no bread. *Which* when Jesus per-
ceived,[2] he said unto them, O ye of little faith, why reason ye among yourselves, be-
9 cause ye have brought [ye took, ἐλάβετε][3] no bread? Do ye not yet understand, nei-
ther [nor] remember the five loaves of the five thousand, and how many baskets
10 [travelling-baskets][4] ye took up [ἐλάβετε]? Neither [Nor] the seven loaves of the
11 four thousand, and how many baskets [provision-baskets] ye took up? How is it that
ye do not understand that I spake *it* not to you concerning bread [spake not to you of
loaves],[5] that ye should [but] beware[6] of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Saddu-
12 cees [and S.][7]? Then understood they how that he bade *them* not beware of the
leaven of bread, but of the doctrine of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees [and S.].[7]

[1] Ver. 6.—[Without the article, which is wanting in the Greek before *Sadducees.*—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 8.—[Better: *And when Jesus perceived it, he said,* or: *And Jesus knowing it said to them,* γνοὺς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς.—P. S.]

[3] Ver. 8.—For ἐλάβετε, B., D., Vulgata, etc., read ἔχετε, *ye have.* So Lachmann. Meyer favors it. Tischendorf [and Alford] adhere to the *Recepta,* which accords best with the connection. [Codex Sinaiticus reads: ἔχετε, and omits the words οὐ μνημονεύετε in the following verse.—P. S.]

[4] Ver. 9.—[Κοφίνους, as distinct from σπυρίδας in ver. 10. "The κόφινος was proverbially the Jewish travelling-basket; comp. Juv. *Sat.* iii. 15: '*Judæis, quorum cophinus fœnumque supellex.*'" Robinson, *Gr. and E. Lex. of the N. T.* Σπυρίς (σπεῖρα) is a round plaited basket for storing grain, bread, fish, and other provisions; comp. Matt. xv. 37; Mark viii. 8, 20; Acts ix. 25. The Vulgate translates the one *cophinos,* the other *sportas;* Ewald uses: *Körbe* and *Handkörbe;* Lange, better: *Reisekörbe* and *Speisekörbe* (*travelling-baskets* and *provision-baskets*); Wiclif: *cofyns* and *lepus;* the Rheims Vers.: *baskets* and *moundes;* Campbell likewise: *baskets* and *maunds;* but all other Engl. Vers. which I compared, use *baskets* in both cases.—P. S.]

[5] Ver. 11.—Tischendorf, following Griesbach and the majority of witnesses, reads the plural ἄρτων. [So also Lachmann, and Alford, who regards the *lect. rec.* ἄρτου as an emendation to express the sense better. Codd. Sinaiticus, Vaticanus, and Ephræmi Syri, the three oldest extant, unanimously sustain the plural, but Cod. Alexandrinus (as published by B. H. Cowper) reads the singular, and so the Lat. Vulgate (*pane*). Lange translates *Brode, loaves.*—P. S.]

[6] Ver. 11.—Προσέχετε δέ, according to B., C., L., al., Lachmann, Tischendorf, against προσέχειν. Hence a repeated admonition, not simply a narrative. *See* Meyer against Fritzsche. [Cod. Sinaiticus, and the English critical editors of the Greek Test., Tregelles and Alford, likewise read the imperative προσέχετε δέ, *but beware,* instead of the infinitive προσέχειν, *to beware,* or *that ye should beware.*—P. S.]

[7] Vers. 11 and 12.—[Omit *of the,* as in ver. 6; the article not being repeated in the Greek.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 5. The circumstance that the disciples forgot to take bread with them forcibly illustrates their excitement, and the haste with which they had left the western shore. According to Mark (viii. 14), they had not more than one loaf in the ship with them. The event here recorded took place during the passage across the lake.

Ver. 6. **The leaven.**—"Ζύμην τὴν διδαχὴν ἐκάλεσεν, ὡς ὀξώδη καὶ σαπράν. Euth. Zigab. On the analogous application of שְׂאֹר by the Rabbins (to every contagious influence of and for evil), *see* Buxtorf, *Lexic. Talm.* p. 2308; Lightfoot on the passage. Differently, xiii. 33." So Meyer. According to Schneckenburger and de Wette, our Lord here referred to the hypocrisy, not to the *teaching* of the Pharisees, which the Lord commends, comp. ch. xxiii. 4 But Meyer rightly insists that the expression refers not to their teaching in general (including their agreement with the law), but only to their sectarian peculiarities.* The ἐντάλματα ἀνθρώπων (xv. 9), however,

* [The Edinb. translator, who never seems to have referred to Meyer, so often quoted in this Commentary, makes him and Lange say here the exact reverse, viz.: "Meyer insists that the expression applied not merely to their own teaching, but also to those points in which they agreed with the law itself." In this case Christ would have warned the disciples against the law of God! But Meyer says, p. 316 (note), after opposing Schneckenburger's and de Wette's reference of the *leaven* to the *hypocrisy* of the Pharisees: "Aus dem Bilde des Sauerteigs erhellt von selbst, dass *nicht* die Lehre jener Secten *überhaupt und im Ganzen* (auch

constitute only one part of the leaven. Applying to the two sects (the Sadducees as well as the Pharisees), the expression must refer to the corruptness of their teaching, arising from their secularism, which, like leaven, had infected and poisoned the whole people, and from which even the disciples were not quite free; more especially Judas, in whose heart this leaven was probably already beginning to operate. On the significance of the leaven, compare our remarks on Matt. xiii. 33.—With the usual superficiality of rationalism, von Ammon (ii. 285) supposes that domestic requirements or business engagements may have rendered the return to the eastern shore necessary, entirely overlooking the deep import of this event. In point of fact, it was a virtual banishment. As such the disciples also felt it. But a short time before they had traversed the length and breadth of the lake under peculiarly trying circumstances. Now they returned in the opposite direction by the same track. A second time they saw Capernaum at a distance, and they felt as if their home there were already lost. The Master read these feelings, and understood their sorrow. With brave determination, but as yet only partially renouncing the world, they followed Him; but their hearts still clung to the scene of their affections and hopes. Under these circumstances, Jesus addressed to them the solemn warning, "Take heed, and beware," etc. "When the children of Israel went out of Egypt, they were commanded to put away the leaven, and to leave it behind them (Ex. xii. 15–17). At the time, the expression referred to the spirit of Egypt as an infectious principle, most powerful for evil. They were not to take to Canaan any of the infectious corruptions of Egypt (comp. 1 Cor. v.; Stier, ii. 158). This journey of the Lord with his disciples resembled the passage of the children of Israel out of Egypt; like them, they now left behind the heathenism of the Pharisees and Sadducees. The Saviour felt that the great Paschal feast—not symbolically, but in reality—was at hand. Withal, He was deeply affected by the thought that, unconsciously, His disciples still carried with them some of the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees." Hence the warning (*see* the author's *Leben Jesu*, ii. 2, 878).

And Sadducees.—Mark has instead: *καὶ τῆς ζύμης Ἡρώδου*. If the Sadducees had enlisted the sympathies of Herod in demanding a sign from heaven, the situation of matters had become even more critical. But this does not necessarily follow from the text. There was a twofold kind of leaven, which might be designated as hypocritical secularism, and distinguished, as assuming in the one case the garb of exclusiveness, in the other that of liberalism. Here we have for the first time an indication of another offence than that of pharisaical exclusiveness, in the shape of the worldly policy of Herod coquetting with the Roman authorities of the land. We see, as it were, the germ of the later calumny, that Jesus claimed to be a king, and must therefore be an enemy to Cæsar.

How many baskets.—From Acts ix. 25, Bengel rightly infers that a *σπυρίς* was larger than a *κόφινος*.

ihre Uebereinstimmung mit dem Gesetze mit eingeschlossen) gemeint gewesen sei, sondern ihre charakteristische *Secten-Lehre*, ihre die Moralität verderbenden *ἐνταλματα ἀνθρώπων* (xv. 9), daher Er auch die Lehre beider *zusammen* als *ζύμη* darstellen konnte, so verschieden auch ihre beiderseitigen Principien waren."—P. 8.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The false exegesis of the disciples on the words of the Saviour may be regarded as the prototype of many a later miserable performance of the same kind. At first they probably tried to understand them literally, and therefore as meaning: Beware of partaking of the bread of the Pharisees and Sadducees, or have no further communion with them. But this would have implied that they would have had to make a separate provision for themselves, as the whole country was divided between the parties of the Pharisees and Sadducees, and hence any provision which they might have got from without would have been impure.—These thoughts were succeeded by the recollection that they had no bread, and by cares which drew down upon them the rebuke of the Lord about the littleness of their faith.

2. *Do ye not yet understand?* The expressions are the same as before in connection with the washing of the hands. Now that the separation had actually commenced, it was high time that they should have better understanding. The Gospel of Mark gives a fuller outline of this rebuke.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The threefold retirement of the Lord across the lake.—Resemblance between the passage of the Lord across the lake and that of the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt.—*Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees:* 1. Its designation: a twofold kind of leaven, and yet in reality only one leaven (exclusive bigotry and lax universalism,—after all only secularity under the guise of piety). 2. The warning: (*a*) Beware; (*b*) so that, while avoiding one of these errors, ye fall not into the other.—To cross with Jesus to the other side implies and requires complete renunciation of the world.—It matters little that we outwardly leave Egypt, if we carry its corruption in our hearts.—The feelings of the Master and those of His disciples on leaving the realm of the Pharisees: 1. The foresight of the Master, and the negligence of the disciples; 2. the freedom from care of the Master, and the anxieties of the disciples; 3. the calmness of the Master, and the excitement and distress of the disciples.—Connection between the memory and the heart: 1. Excitement the spring of forgetfulness; 2. calmness and peace the surest means of presence of mind.—The circumstance that the disciples had so frequently misinterpreted the meaning of the Lord, recorded for our warning.—Principal causes of false interpretations of the word of God: 1. Slavish literality; 2. personal interests; 3. fear; 4. arbitrary perversions.—How the Lord had to repeat to His disciples, and to question them on, the history of the twofold feeding of the multitude.—The anxiety of the disciples after the miraculous feeding of the multitude itself a mournful wonder.—Although the Lord ever performs new miracles, yet faith in Him still continues a miracle.—*Then understood they* (ver. 12): when error is removed, truth finds an entrance.—The Lord emphatically reiterates: Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees.—The leaven of Jewish legalism and of heathen secularism in the Church of Christ.

Starke:—Quesnel: We do not lose by following Christ so closely as for a time to forget every earthly consideration, since, after all, we have the best

part, Ps. lxxiii. 25.—*Majus:* Let us not mix up different creeds.—Beware of heretics and false teachers. —*Cramer:* As leaven pervades the whole mass, so will a single error on any fundamental doctrine corrupt all our other views, depriving them of their spiritual value, 2 Tim. ii. 17.—*Zeisius:* Hearers are apt to suppose that certain sermons are aimed against them, while this may be due to the voice of their own conscience, not to the words of the preacher.—*Majus:* The mistakes of disciples, and their consequences.—*Canstein:* How often does anxiety for daily bread take the place of anxiety for the soul!—Jesus searching the heart.—Christ bearing with the weakness of our faith, and giving more grace.—*Cramer:* Frequent meditation on the past gracious and wonderful provisions of our God an approved remedy for unbelief.—How frequently is it thus that they who ought to have been teachers have need to be taught again the first principles of divine truth!

Gerlach:—The words of Jesus may be misinterpreted or forgotten simply from weakness of faith.—Accordingly, the Lord rebukes not so much their ignorance, as their weakness of faith and their carnality, which was the source of that ignorance.

Heubner: — Pharisaism: appearance of piety, hypocritical ostentation of faith. Sadducism: appearance of a spirit of inquiry, concealment of faith from fear of men.—On ver. 7: Similarly we might say, Simple-minded Christians do not understand the arts and plans by which unbelief undermines Christianity.—Vers. 8-10: A clear evidence this that the Apostles were neither credulous, nor on the watch for miracles.

PART THIRD.

Christ presents the future history of the Kingdom of Heaven, in opposition to the Ancient World and the Theocracy.

Contents (from ch. xvi. 13-xx. 16):—The period has now arrived for founding the Church of Christ, or ἐκκλησία, as a distinct and visible Community, in opposition to that ancient form of the Theocracy which was henceforth doomed to judgment. The open and full confession that Jesus was the Christ, the Son of God, formed, so to speak, the moment when the ἐκκλησία was born. From that hour Christ manifested and owned His Church as such, through the confession which the Church made of Him. This Church is here presented in its leading characteristics: 1. In its *prophetic* character as confessing Christ, from ch. xvi. 13-xvii. 27; 2. in its *priestly* capacity, from ch. xviii. 1-xix. 26; 3. in its *kingly* manifestation, from ch. xix. 27-xx. 16.

FIRST SECTION.

THE CHURCH IN ITS PROPHETIC CHARACTER, AS CONFESSING CHRIST, THE SON OF GOD, IN OPPOSITION TO THE LEGAL OPINIONS CONCERNING HIM, ENTERTAINED BY THE SYNAGOGUE.

Chapter XVI. 13-XVII. 27.

The Church of Christ in its *prophetic* character is here set before us, first, as confessing Christ, ch. xvi. 13-20; then as bearing the cross of Christ, in contrast to that worldly fear of the cross by which He was assailed, vers. 21-28; then, as in real fellowship with the spirits of the blessed, in opposition to the solitary tabernacles of spurious separation from the world, ch. xvii. 1-8.—Next, the Church is described as wholly unknown and hidden, vers. 9-13; yet as wonder-working, vers. 14-21; though still in human weakness, vers. 22, 23; as free, but voluntarily subject and paying tribute to the old temple, vers. 24-27.

The historical succession of events was as follows:—In company with His disciples, the Lord passed along the left bank of the Jordan, toward the mountains. At Bethsaida Julias He performed the cure of a blind person (recorded in Mark viii. 22), at the same time enjoining strict silence upon him. Thence they continued their journey to the immediate neighborhood of Cæsarea Philippi, touching (as it would seem from Mark viii. 27) only the adjoining villages, but avoiding the town itself. It was in these coasts, or district, that the Lord evoked the confession of Peter, which was followed by

the announcement of the foundation of His Church, ἐκκλησία. Immediately afterward, Jesus distinctly announced His impending sufferings, since these were connected with the foundation of His Church, as the latter was with the confession of His name. On this occasion Peter began to rebuke Him; and he who had lately been commended as confessing, was now reproved as tempting. The event just recorded led to the admonition, addressed to His disciples generally, on the subject of taking up the cross and following Him. A week later, the Lord called His three most intimate disciples to witness His transfiguration on the Mount. As they came down, Jesus explained to them the advent and mission of Elijah. At the foot of the mountain, the healing of the lunatic boy, possessed with a devil, took place. From thence Jesus secretly passed through Galilee, probably for the purpose of acquainting His friends with those impending sufferings, for which He had already prepared His disciples. Refusing the solicitation of His brethren to join the caravan going up to the feast, He went secretly to Jerusalem, to the Feast of Tabernacles, which was celebrated in autumn. Thus the history advances to the month of October of the year 782 (according to Wieseler, to the 12th October), John vii. 1-10. In Jerusalem the events recorded in John vii. 11, etc., took place, when Jesus pointed to the fulfilment of the Old Testament symbols in His life. The healing of the man blind from his birth (John ix.), hastened the full and final determination of the Jewish authorities to put Him to death. But in all probability Jesus did not continue in Judea during the interval between the Feast of Tabernacles in October, and the festival of the Dedication of the Temple in December (according to Wieseler, the 27th December). During that period He appears to have paid a farewell visit to Galilee, and to have passed from Samaria to Perea, where He tarried till the feast of the Dedication of the Temple (*Leben Jesu*, ii. 2, 1003). After His return to Galilee, Jesus again appeared in public, though probably, as in Jerusalem, only surrounded by a large number of His friends. For the last time Jesus now came to Capernaum, where He was asked for the payment of the temple tribute, ch. xvii. 24–27. Thus far our section.

A. *The Church as confessing Christ, the Son of God.* CH. XVI. 13–20.

(*The Gospel for the Festival of St. Peter and Paul.*—Parallels: Mark viii. 27–30; Luke ix. 18–21.)

13 When Jesus came into the coasts [parts, τὰ μέρη] of Cesarea Philippi, he asked his
14 disciples, saying, Whom [Who] do men say that I,[1] the Son of man, am? And they
said, Some *say that thou art* John the Baptist; some, Elias [Elijah]; and others, Jere-
15 mias [Jeremiah], or one of the prophets. He saith unto them, But whom [who] say
16 ye that I am? And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ [the Messiah],
17 the Son of the living God. And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou,
Simon Bar-jona [Bar Jonah, son of Jonah][2]: for flesh and blood hath not revealed *it*
18 unto thee, but my Father which [who] is in heaven [the heavens]. And I say also
[And I also, κἀγὼ δέ, say] unto thee, That thou art Peter [Πέτρος], and upon [on] this
rock [πέτρα][3] I will build my Church [ἐκκλησία];[4] and the gates of hell [hades][5] shall
19 not prevail against it.[6] And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven
[the heavens]: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven [the
heavens]; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven [the
heavens].
20 Then charged[7] he his [the][8] disciples that they should tell no man that he was
Jesus the Christ [he is the Christ].[9]

[1] Ver. 13.—The pers. pron. μέ in Cod. C. after λέγουσι, [in the *text. rec.* before the verb], is wanting in Cod. B. [and in Cod. Sinaiticus] and in several versions, and is omitted by Tischendorf [and Tregelles and Alford]; Lachmann retains it, but in brackets. The insertion is more easily explained than the omission.—[If we omit μέ, we must translate, with Campbell and Conant: WHO *do men say that the Son of Man is?* Or with Alford, who retains the grammatical anomaly, if not blunder, of the Author. Vers.: WHOM (τίνα) *do men say that the Son of Man is?* Τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου is equivalent to *I* in the corresponding sentence below, ver. 15. Some who retain μέ in the text (Beza, Clericus, etc.) translate: *Who do men say that I am? the Son of Man? i. e.*, Do they believe me to be the Messiah? But this does not suit the form of the answer, and would require either an affirmative *Yea*, or a negative *No*. In the received text τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ must be regarded as in apposition to μέ, and is so rendered in the E. V.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 17.—[*Bar* (בַּר) is the Aramaic or Chaldaic word used by Daniel in the prophetic passage, vii. 13 ("*I saw . . . and one like the Son of Man came with the clouds of heaven,*" etc.), for the Hebrew *ben* (בֵּן), *son*. In the Authorized E. V. it is retained as the patronymic of Peter, as Matthew retained it in Greek: Βὰρ Ἰωνᾶ; Jerome in Latin: *Bar-Jona;* Bengel, de Wette, and Ewald in their German Versions: *Bar-Jona;* while Tyndale, Cranmer's, and the Geneva Bibles, also Luther and Lange translate it into the corresponding vernacular. Compare similar compound names: *Bar-*

Abbas, Bar-Jesus, Bar-Nabas, Bar-Sabas, Bar-Timæus, Bar-Tholomæus. The translation depends on whether the name is here simply the patronymic, or whether it has an allegorical meaning, as Olshausen and Lange contend. In the latter case it must be translated: *son* of Jonah, or Jonas. *See* Lange's *Exeg. Note*, and my protesting footnote, on ver. 17. —P. S.]

[3] Ver. 18.—[Σὺ εἶ Πέτρος, καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ,—one of the profoundest and most far-reaching prophetical, but, at the same time, one of the most controverted sayings of the Saviour, the exegetical rock on which the Papacy rests its gigantic claims (but not by direct proof, but by inference and with the help of undemonstrable intervening assumptions, as the transferability of Peter's primacy, his presence in Rome, and his actual transfer of the primacy upon the bishop of Rome), under the united protest of the whole Greek Catholic and Protestant Evangelical Churches, who contend that Christ says not a word about successors. Leaving the fuller exposition to the *Exegetical Notes*, we have to do here simply with the verbal rendering. In our Engl. Vers., as also in the German, the emphasis is lost, since *rock* and *Fels* are never used as proper names. We might literally translate: "Thou art *Peter* and upon this *petress;*" or: "Thou art *Stone, Rockman, Man of rock* (*Felsenmann*), and upon this *rock;*" but neither of them would sound idiomatic and natural. It is perhaps remarkable that the languages of the two most Protestant nations cannot render the sentence in any way favorable to the popish identification of the rock of the church with the person of Peter; while the Latin Vulgate simply retained the Greek *Petrus* and *petra*, and the French translation: "Tu es *Pierre*, et sur cette *pierre*," even obliterates the distinction of the gender. The Saviour, no doubt, used in both clauses the Aramaic word כֵּיפָא (hence the Greek Κηφᾶς applied to Simon, John i. 42; comp. 1 Cor. i. 12; iii. 22; ix. 5; xv. 5; Gal. ii. 9), which means *rock* and is used both as a proper and a common noun. Hence the old Syriac translation of the N. T. renders the passage in question thus: "*Anath-her* KIPHA, *v'all hode* KIPHA." The Arabic translation has *alsachra* in both cases. The proper translation then would be: "*Thou art Rock, and upon this rock,*" etc. Yet it should not be overlooked that Matthew in rendering the word into Greek, no doubt under the influence of the Holy Spirit, deliberately changed the gender, using the masculine in the one case and the feminine in the other. He had, of course, to use Πέτρος in addressing a *man* (as Maldonatus *in loc.* correctly remarks: *Petrus, quia vir erat, non petra fœmineo, sed Petrus masculino nomine vocandus erat*); but he might with perfect propriety have continued: ἐπὶ τούτῳ τῷ Πέτρῳ, instead of ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ (which change Maldonatus less satisfactorily accounts for simply on the philological reason that the masculine πέτρος *et Atticum et rarum est*). The masculine πέτρος in Greek (in Homer and elsewhere) means generally only a *piece* of rock, or a *stone* (like the corresponding prose word λίθος), and very rarely a *rock*. (Meyer, however, quotes for the latter signification a passage from Plato: Σισύφου πέτρος, one from Sophocles, and one from Pindar); but the feminine πέτρα always signifies *rock*, whether it be used literally or metaphorically (as a symbol of firmness, but also of hardheartedness). I would not press this distinction, in view of the Syriac כֵּיפָא, and in opposition to such eminent commentators as Bengel and Meyer, who, like the Rom. Cath. commentators, admit no difference of the terms in this case. (Bengel: *hæc duo,* πέτρα *et* πέτρος *stant pro uno nomine, sicut unum utrinque nomen* KEPHA *legitur in Syriaco.*") But it is certainly possible, and to my mind almost certain, that Matthew *expressed* by the slight change of word in Greek, what the Saviour *intended* in using, necessarily, the same word in Syriac, viz., that the *petra* on which the Church is built by Christ, the Divine architect and Lord of this spiritual temple, is not the *person* of Peter *as such*, but something more deep and comprehensive; in other words, that it is *Peter and his confession* of the central mystery of Christianity, or Peter *as the confessor of Christ*, Peter *in* Christ, and Peter, moreover, as representing *all the other apostles* in like relation to Christ (comp. Eph. ii. 20; Rev. xxi. 14). Nor should we explain ver. 18 independently of ver. 23. It is very significant that, while the *believing* and *confessing* Peter here is called rock, the *disobedient* and *dissuading* Peter immediately afterward (ver. 23), with surprising severity, is called for the time being Satan, the enemy of Christ. If the papacy has any claim to the rocklike nature of Peter, it has certainly also fallen at times under the condemnation of the satanic, anti-christian, and denying Peter. Let us hope that it may imitate Peter also in his sincere repentance after the denial. Bengel: *Videat Petra romana, ne cadat sub censuram versus* 23.—Comp. the *Exeg. Notes* below, and my *History of the Apostolic Church*, § 89, p. 351 sqq.—P. S.]

[4] Ver. 18.—[All the English versions before Queen Elizabeth, except that of Wiclif (which reads *chirche*), translate ἐκκλησία by the corresponding English word *congregation;* but the Bishops' Bible substituted for it *church*, and this, by express direction of King James, was retained not only here, but in all other passages of the N. T. in the revised and authorized version of 1611. Among German translators and commentators, the Roman Catholics (van Ess, Arnoldi, Allioli) render ἐκκλησία by the term *Kirche* (*church*); while the Protestant translators and commentators (Luther, John Friedr. von Meyer, Stier, de Wette, Ewald, H. A. W. Meyer, and Lange) render: *Gemeinde* (*congregation*). The Greek ἐκκλησία, from ἐκκαλέω, *to call out, to summon*, occurs 114 times in the N. T. (twice in the Gospel of Matthew, but in no other Gospel, 24 times in the Acts, 68 times in the Epistles, 20 times in Revelation), and corresponds to the Hebrew קָהָל. It is not to be confounded with the more spiritual and comprehensive term *kingdom of God* or *kingdom of heaven*, so often used by our Saviour. It means generally any popular convocation, congregation, assembly, and in a Christian sense the *congregation of believers* called out of the world and consecrated to the service of Christ. It is used in the N. T. (1) in a *general* sense, of the *whole body of Christian believers*, or the church *universal*, Matt. xvi. 18; 1 Cor. xii. 28; Gal. i. 13; Eph. i. 22 (and in all the passages where the church is called the *body of Christ*); 1 Tim. iii. 15; Heb. xii. 23, etc.; (2) more frequently in a *particular* sense, of a *local congregation*, as in Jerusalem, in Antioch, in Ephesus, in Corinth, in Rome, in Galatia, in Asia Minor, etc.; hence, also, it is often used in the plural, *e. g.*, αἱ ἐκκλησίαι τῆς Ἀσίας, 1 Cor. xvi. 19; αἱ ἐκκλησίαι τῶν ἐθνῶν, Rom. xvi. 4; the seven churches, Rev. i. 4, 11, 20, etc. The Saviour Himself makes use of the word only twice, viz.: in our passage, where it evidently means the church *universal*, which alone is indestructible, and in Matt. xviii. 17, where it can be understood only of a *local* church or congregation (*tell it to the church*). John never uses the term except in his third epistle. The word *church* is properly no translation of ἐκκλησία at all, but has etymologically a different meaning, being derived from the Greek κυριακόν, *i. e.*, *belonging to the Lord*, through the medium of the Gothic, whence also the cognate terms in the Teutonic and Slavonic languages, the German *Kirche*, the Scotch *kirk*, the Swedish *kyrka*, the Danish *kyrke*, the Russian *serkow*, the Polish *cerkiew*, the Bohemian *syrkew*. (Leo, *Ferienschriften*, Halle, 1847, derives the word from the Celtic *cyrch* or *cylch*, *i. e.*, centre, meeting place; but this would not explain the introduction of the word into the Slavonic nations, who received Christianity from the Greek church.) The word *church* is now used both in the general and in the particular sense, like ἐκκλησία, and in addition to this also in a third sense, viz., of a *building*, or house of worship (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, ix. 10, calls the meeting houses of the Christians κυριακὰ οἰκεῖα). As regards the English translation of ἐκκλησία, a number of modern commentators advocate a return to the term *congregation* throughout the whole N. T. But it is neither possible nor desirable to expel the term *church* from the English Bible, which has long since become the full equivalent of the Greek ἐκκλησία. We might use *church*, where the word signifies the whole body of believers, and *congregation*, where a particular or local assembly of Christians is intended. But even this is unnecessary. The Geneva Bible also employed the term *church* in a few passages, though not in ours, where it seems to me to be more appropriate than *congregation*.—P. S.]

[5] Ver. 18.—[Πύλαι ᾅδου, in Hebrew שַׁעֲרֵי שְׁאוֹל, *shaăre sheol*, an alliteration, Isa. xxxviii. 10. On *hades*, as distinct from *hell*, compare the *Exeg. Notes* below, and also the *Crit. Notes* on xi. 23, p. 210.—P. S.]

[6] Ver. 18.—[Οὐ μὴ κατισχύσουσιν αὐτῆς, from κατισχύειν τινος, *prævalere adversus aliquem*, comp. Isa. xv. 18, Sept. Tyndale, the Bishops', King James', and the Douay Bibles agree in translating: *shall not prevail against it;* the Lat. Vulgate: *non prævalebunt adversus eam;* Luther, de Wette, Ewald, Lange: *überwältigen*,

Meyer: *die Obermacht haben* (*behalten*). I prefer the *prevail* of the Authorized Vers. to *overcome* (Geneva Bible), as expressing better the idea of long-continued resistance on the part of hades. The term must be explained in conformity to the architectural figure which runs through this whole passage:—*gates*, *build*, *keys*. Hades is represented as a hostile fortress which stands over against the apparently defenceless, yet immovable temple of the Christian Church, to which our Lord here promises *indestructible life*. (*Ecclesia non potest deficere.*) The gates of hades, or the realm of death, by virtue of the universal dominion of sin, admit and confine all men, and (like the gates in Dante's *Inferno* with the famous terrific inscription) were barred against all return, until the Saviour overcame death and "him that hath the power of death" (Heb. ii. 14), and came forth unharmed and triumphant from the empire of death as conqueror and Prince of life. Hades could not retain Him (Acts ii. 27, 31). The same power of life He imparts to His people, who often, especially during the ages of persecution and martyrdom, seemed to be doomed to destruction, but always rose to new life and vigor, and shall reign with Christ forever. Comp. Rev. i. 18: "I am alive forevermore, and have the keys of death and hades;" and 1 Cor. xv. 26: "The last enemy that shall be destroyed, is death." This interpretation of the figure appears to me much more appropriate than the usual one, which takes hades here in the sense of *hell*, and assumes an active *assault* of the infernal armies, rushing, as it were, through these gates and storming the fortress of Christ's Church. To this interpretation I object: (1) That *gates* are not an active and *aggressive*, but a passive and *confining* power; (2) that *hades*, although closely related to gehenna or hell and including it, is yet a wider conception, and means here, as elsewhere, the realm of death (*das Reich der Todten*), which swallows up all mortals and confines forever those who have no part in the victory of Christ over death, hell, and damnation.—P. S.]

[7] Ver. 20.—*Lect. rec.*: διεστείλατο [*præcepit, imperavit*]. Codd. B., D.: ἐπετίμησεν [*comminatus est*], probably from Mark viii. 30; Luke ix. 21.

[8] Ver. 20.—[The oldest MSS., including Cod. Sinait., read simply: τοῖς μαθηταῖς without αὐτοῦ. Meyer and Lange overlook this difference of reading. *See* Tregelles and Alford.—P. S.]

[9] Ver. 20.—Ἰησοῦς is wanting in important MSS. [The correct reading of all critical editions, sustained by the oldest MSS., including Cod. Sinait., the ancient versions, and patristic quotations, is simply: ὅτι αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ Χριστός, *that he is the Christ* (the promised Messiah). The insertion of *Jesus* in later MSS. was a blunder of some mechanical copyist, who paid no attention to the connection, and added the personal to the official appellation, according to the usual designation of our Lord. Everybody knew and admitted the *personal* name of our Saviour, and it would have been useless to deny or to affirm that He was Jesus.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 13. **Into the parts of Cæsarea Philippi.**—The cure of the blind person at the eastern Bethsaida (Mark xiii. 22) had taken place before that. *Cæsarea Philippi*, formerly called *Paneas* (Plin. *H. N.* V. 15), from the mountain Panius, dedicated to Pan, in the immediate neighborhood. The town is supposed to have been the ancient *Leshem*, Josh. xix. 47; *Laish*, Judg. xviii. 7; and *Dan*—"from Dan to Beersheba." It lay near the sources of Jordan, at the foot of Mount Lebanon, a day's journey from Sidon, in Gaulonitis, and was partly inhabited by heathens. The town was enlarged and beautified by Philip the Tetrarch, who called it *Cæsarea* (*Kingston*) in honor of Cæsar Tiberius. The name *Philippi* was intended to distinguish it from *Cæsarea Palestinæ* (Robinson, *Palest.* ii. 439; also, vol. iii. sect. ix.). Tradition reports that the woman with the issue of blood resided here. Her name is said to have been Berenice. Agrippa II. further embellished this city, and called it *Neronias* in honor of Nero. The modern village of Banias, and the ruins around it, mark the site of the ancient city.

Who [not whom] do men say that I am?—How do men explain the appearance of the Son of Man? Meyer: What do they understand by the designation, Son of Man? De Wette: I who am a humble, lowly man. But this completely misses the peculiar import of the expression, *Son of Man*.

Ver. 14. **Some say.**—"The reply shows that, in general, He was *not yet* looked upon as the Messiah." Meyer. But according to the representation of the evangelist, we must rather infer that Christ's enemies had by their calumnies succeeded in lowering the popular estimate concerning Him.

John the Baptist.—*See* ch. xiv. 2. This, for a time, had been the opinion of the courtiers of Herod. —**Elijah,**—as the precursor of the Messiah. Such was the view professed by those whom fear of their superiors induced to deny His claims to the Messianic office, while, from a desire of not entirely surrendering the expectations which had been excited by His appearance, they still regarded Him as a prophet.—**Jeremiah.**—Of course, in the same sense as **Elijah,**—not in the sense of literally revisiting the earth, nor in that of implying the doctrine of the transmigration of souls [metempsychosis].* The opinion of these persons concerning Jesus was evidently lower than that of those who regarded Him as Elijah (Mark xv. 35; John i. 21). The one party referred especially to what might be designated as the reformation inaugurated by Jesus, while the other had regard to His denunciations of the corruptions of the times.—**Or one of the prophets.**—According to the lowest view, He was represented by discouraged friends as one of the old prophets. Three points are clearly brought out in this conversation: 1. That, to a certain extent, Jesus was still generally acknowledged by the people. 2. That the faith of the majority had been lowered and misled by the influence of their superiors, so that diverging opinions were now entertained regarding Him. 3. That this inconstancy and wavering led to a decreasing measure of homage.

Ver. 15. **But who say ye that I am?**—This was the decisive moment in which the separation of the New Testament ἐκκλησία from the Old Testament theocracy was to be made. The hour had come for the utterance of a distinct Christian confession.

Ver. 16. **Simon Peter.**— Peter answered not merely in his own name, but in that of all the disciples.†—**Thou art the Christ,**—*i. e.*, the Messiah Himself. And this not in the sense in which carnal Jewish traditionalism held the doctrine of the Messiah, but in the true and spiritual import of the title—

* [Some, however, no doubt believed in a bodily resurrection of Elijah or Jeremiah. The latter was accounted by the Jews as the first in the prophetic canon. *See* Lightfoot on Matt. xxvii. 9.—P. S.]

† [This is the correct view, already maintained by the fathers, *e. g.*, Chrysostom, who, in Hom. 54, calls Peter in this connection *the mouth of the apostles*, τὸ στόμα τῶν ἀποστόλων, by Jerome: *Petrus ex persona omnium apostolorum profitetur*, and by Thomas Aquinas: *Ipse respondet et pro se et pro aliis*. Some Rom. Cath. commentators, as Passaglia and Arnoldi, for obvious reasons, maintain that Peter spoke only in his own name. But the Saviour addressed His question to all the disciples, and they certainly must have assented to Peter's confession of faith, which they had from the time of their calling, and without which they could not have been apostles. Comp. John i. 42, 46, 50, also the remarks of Dr. Schegg, a Rom. Cath. Com., *in loc.* (vol. ii. p. 349).—P. S.]

the Son of the living God.—The latter expression must not be taken merely in a *negative* sense, as denoting the *True God* in opposition to false deities; it must also be viewed in a *positive* sense, as referring to Him whose manifestations in Israel were completed in and crowned by the appearance of His Son as the Messiah. This, however, implies Sonship not only in a moral or official, but also in the ontological sense. Thus the reply of Peter had all the characteristics of a genuine confession—being *decided, solemn*, and *deep*.

[The confession of Peter is the first and fundamental Christian confession of faith, and the germ of the Apostles' Creed. It is a confession, not of mere human opinions, or views, or convictions, however firm, but of a divinely wrought faith, and not of faith only (*I believe that Thou art*), but of adoration and worship (*Thou art*). It is christological, *i. e.*, a confession of Jesus Christ as the centre and heart of the whole Christian system, and the only and all-sufficient fountain of spiritual life. It is a confession of Jesus Christ as a true man (*Thou*, Jesus), as the promised Messiah (*the Christ*), and as the eternal Son of God (*the Son*—not *a* son—*of the living God*), hence as the God-Man and Saviour of the world. It is thus a confession of the mystery of the Incarnation in the widest sense, the great central mystery of godliness, "God manifest in the flesh."—Compare also the excellent remarks of Olshausen (in Kendrick's Am. ed., vol. i. p. 545 sq.) and Alford, who, following Olshausen, says *in loc.*: "The confession is not made in the terms of the other answer: it is not '*we say*,' or '*I say*,' but '**Thou art.**' It is the expression of an inward conviction wrought by God's Spirit. The excellence of this confession is, that it brings out both the human and the divine nature of the Lord: ὁ Χριστός is the Messiah, the Son of David, the anointed King; ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος is the Eternal Son, begotten of the Eternal Father, as the last word most emphatically implies, not 'Son of God' in any inferior figurative sense, not *one* of the sons of God, of angelic nature, but **the Son of the living God**, having in Him the Sonship and the divine nature, *in a sense in which they could be in none else*. This was the view of the person of Christ quite distinct from the Jewish Messianic idea, which appears to have been (Justin Mart. *Dial.* p. 267) that he should be born from men, but selected by God for the office on account of his eminent virtues. This distinction accounts for the solemn blessing pronounced in the next verse. Ζῶντος must not for a moment be taken here, as it sometimes is used (*e. g.*, Acts xiv. 15), as merely distinguishing the true God from dead idols: it is here emphatic, and imparts force and precision to υἱός. That Peter, when he uttered the words, understood by them in detail all that we now understand, is not of course here asserted, but that they were his testimony to the true Humanity and true Divinity of the Lord, in that sense of deep truth and reliance, out of which springs the Christian life of the Church." Meyer, indeed, takes τοῦ ζῶντος simply as the solemn epithet of the *true* God in opposition to the dead idols of the heathen; but there was no reason here for contrasting the true God with heathen idols, and Peter must have meant to convey the idea, however imperfectly understood by him at the time, that the Godhead itself was truly revealed in, and reflected from, the human person of Christ in a sense and to a degree compared with which all former manifestations of God appeared to him like dead shadows. He echoed the declaration from heaven at Christ's baptism: "This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased," and recognized in Him the essential and eternal life of the great Jehovah.—P. S.]

Ver. 17. **Jesus answered.**—Also a confession, decided, solemn, and deep; being the divine confession of the Lord in favor of the Church, which had now confessed His name, and of her first witness.

Blessed art thou (comp. Rom. x. 9), **Simon, son of Jonah.***—Meyer denies in vain the antithesis between this address and the new title given to Peter. Different views have been taken in reference to this antithesis. 1. Paulus explains it: Simon, or obedient hearer,—son of Jonas, or son of oppression. 2. Olshausen: יוֹנָה, *dove*, with reference to the Holy Spirit under the figure of a dove. Thou, Simon, art a child of the Spirit. 3. Lange (*Leben Jesu*, ii. 2, 469): Thou, Simon, son of a dove (which makes its nest in the rock, a figure of the Church), shalt be called a rock (the rocklike dwelling-place of the dove, *i. e.*, of the Church).† With this antithesis the other in the same verse is connected. According to the flesh, thou art a natural son of Jonah; but according to this revelation of the Spirit, a child of the Father who is in heaven (referring to his regeneration, and consequent faith and confession). [Similarly Alford: The name "*Simon Bar Jonas*" is doubtless used as indicating his fleshly state and extraction, and forming the greater contrast to his spiritual state, name, and blessing, which follow. The name Σίμων Ἰωνᾶ, Simon, *son* of Jonas or Jonah, is uttered when he is reminded by the thrice-repeated inquiry, "Lovest thou me?" of his frailty, in his previous denial of his Lord, John xxi. 15, 16, 17.—P. S.]

Flesh and blood.—Various views have been taken of this expression. 1. Calvin, Beza, Neander, de Wette, refer it to our physical nature in opposition to the πνεῦμα. To this Meyer objects, that our physical nature is termed in Scripture only σάρξ, not σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα (in 1 Cor. xv. 50, "*flesh and blood*" should be literally understood). 2. According to Lightfoot and Meyer, it must be taken (with special reference to the fact, that the Rabbins use בָּשָׂר וְדָם as a kind of paraphrase for *Son of man*, including the accessory idea of the weakness involved in our corporeal nature), as simply denoting *weak man*, equivalent to *nemo mortalium* (as in Gal. i. 16). 3. We explain it: the natural, carnal descent, as contrasted with spiritual generation. John i. 13: οἳ οὐκ ἐξ αἱμάτων, οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος σαρκός, κ. τ. λ. This appears still further from the connection between the expressions, "*flesh and blood*" and "*son of Jonah*," and from the antithesis, "*My Father who*

* [According to Lange's version. Comp. my critical note above.—P. S.]

† [I confess that this allegorical exposition of the term appears to me as far-fetched and as improbable as that of Olshausen. *Bar-Jona* has nothing to do with a dove, but is a contraction for *Bar-Joanna* (Chaldaic), *i. e.*, *Son of John*, as is evident from John xxi. 15, 16, 17, where Christ addresses Peter: Σίμων Ἰωάννου. But there may be in this use of the patronymic an allusion to the title *Son of Man* in ver. 13, which would give additional emphasis to the counter confession, in this sense: That I, the Son of Man, am at the same time the Messiah and the eternal Son of God, is as true as that thou, Simon, art the son of Jona; and as thou hast thus confessed Me as the Messiah, I will now confess thee as Peter, etc. If the Saviour spoke in Aramaic or Chaldaic, as He undoubtedly did on ordinary occasions and with His disciples, He used the term *Bar* in ver. 17, with reference to Dan. vii. 13, the prophetic passage from which the Messianic appellation *Son of Man* was derived, so that *Bar-enahsh* (*Son of Man*) and *Bar-Jona* would correspond.—P. S.]

is in heaven." Hence Gal. i. 16 must mean: When I received a commission to preach to the Gentiles, I conferred not with my Jewish nationality; and Eph. vi. 12: In reality, we wrestle not with beings of human kind, but with the powers of darkness, whose representatives and instruments they are; and 1 Cor. xv. 50: The kind which is of this world (of the first man, who is of the earth) shall not inherit the kingdom of God; but we must enter it by a complete transformation into a second and new life which is from heaven. Accordingly, the antithesis in the text is between knowledge resulting from natural human development, or on the basis of natural birth, and knowledge proceeding from the revelation of the Father in heaven, or on the basis of regeneration.

Hath not revealed it,—but My Father.—A difficulty has been felt, how to reconcile this declaration with the fact, that the disciples had at a much earlier period recognized Jesus as the Messiah (John i. 42, 46, 50). 1. Olshausen holds that this confession of Peter indicates a much more advanced state of knowledge: ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, τοῦ ζῶντος. 2. Neander thinks that all earlier revelations had more or less proceeded from flesh and blood. 3. Meyer suggests that the text refers to that first acknowledgment of Jesus as the Messiah, in consequence of which the disciples came and surrendered themselves to Him.* 4. In our view, the new element in this confession lies, first of all, in its ethical form. It was no longer a mere knowledge (or recognition) of Christ. While the general *knowledge* of the Jews concerning the Messiah had retrograded, and degenerated into discordant and self-contradictory *opinions*, the knowledge of the disciples had *advanced*, and was now summed up and concentrated into an act of spiritual faith in Peter's confession, which, in view of the hostility of the Jewish rulers, may be characterized as a real martyrdom (μαρτυρία). Another new element lay in the view now expressed concerning the Messiah. On all the main points, the Jewish and traditional notions of the Messiah had evidently been thrown off, and a pure and spiritual faith attained from converse with the life of Jesus. In both these respects, it was a revelation of the Father in heaven, *i. e.*, a heavenly and spiritual production. The new life was germinating in the hearts of the disciples.—De Wette regards this passage as incompatible with the earlier acknowledgments of the Messiah; while Fritzsche, Schneckenburger, and Strauss talk of a twofold period in Christ's ministry: the first, when He was a disciple of John; the second, when He attained to consciousness of His Messianic dignity. But these critics have wholly misunderstood this narrative.

Ver. 18. **But I also say unto thee.**—The expression shows in a striking manner the reciprocity existing between Christ and His disciples. Their confession solicits His confession.†

* [Not exactly. In the fourth edition of his *Com. on Matt.*, p. 320, Meyer assumes that Peter, although long since convinced, with the rest of the disciples, of the Messiahship of Jesus, was on this occasion favored with a special divine revelation on the subject, and spoke from a state of inspiration. "*Daher*," he says, "*ist* ἀπεκάλυψε *nicht auf eine schon beim ersten Anschliessen an Jesum erhaltene Offenbarung, welche den Jüngern geworden, zu beziehen, sondern auf* PETRUS *und eine* IHN *auszeichnende besondere* ἀποκάλυψις *zu beschränken.*" But Peter confessed in the name of all the other apostles, *see* p. 294.—P. S.]

† [MALDONATUS: "ET EGO. *Elegans antithesis, Græce etiam efficacior:* κἀγὼ δέ, SED ET EGO DICO TIBI; *quasi dicat: tu, qui homo es, Filium Dei vivi me esse dixisti, ego vero, qui Filius Dei vivi sum, dico te esse Petrum, id est vicarium meum* [?], *quem Filium Dei esse confessus es. Nam Ecclesiam meam, quæ super me ædificata est, super te etiam, tanquam super secundarium quoddam fundamentum ædificabo.*"—P. S.]

Thou art Peter,—Πέτρος, in Aramaic כֵּיפָא, *the stone*, or *the rock* (*see* Meyer). The Greek masculine noun arose from the translation of the name into Greek; the name itself had been given at an earlier period, John i. 42. It was now bestowed a second time to indicate *the relationship subsisting between Peter and the Ecclesia*, rather than to prove that Peter really was what his name implied (Meyer). From the first this name was intended to be symbolical; although its real meaning was only attained at a later period in the history of Peter. But at the same time the words of Jesus imply the acknowledgment that his character as Peter had just appeared in this confession. [It should be observed that in John i. 42 (in the Gr. text, ver. 43) we read: "Thou *shalt be called* (κληθήσῃ) Cephas," but here: "Thou *art* (εἶ) Peter."—P. S.]

And on this rock.—For the various interpretations of this passage, *see* Wolf's *Curæ*. We submit the following summary of them: 1. The term "rock" is referred to *Christ* Himself. Thus Jerome,* Augustine,† Chemnitz, Fabricius, and oth-

* [This needs modification. JEROME, in his *Comment. on Matt.* xvi. 18 (*Opera*, ed. Vallars., tom. vii. p. 124), explains the passage thus: "*Sicut ipse lumen Apostolis donavit, ut lumen mundi appellarentur, cæteraque ex Domino sortiti sunt vocabula: ita et Simoni*, QUI CREDEBAT IN PETRAM CHRISTUM, *Petri largitus est nomen. Ac secundum metaphoram petræ, recte dicitur ei:* ÆDIFICABO ECCLESIAM MEAM SUPER TE." The last words (*super te*) show that he referred the *petra* not only to Christ, but in a derivative sense also to Peter as the confessor. So in another passage (*Ep. ad Damas. papam*, Ep. 15, ed. Vall., i. 37 sq.) he says of *Peter*: "*super illam petram ædificatam ecclesiam scio.*" Jerome also regards the bishop of Rome as the successor of Peter, but advocates elsewhere the equal rights of bishops, so that he can be quoted only in favor of a Roman primacy of honor, not of a supremacy of jurisdiction. Comp. on Jerome's views concerning the papacy the second vol. of my *General Church History*, now preparing for the press, § 61, p. 304 sq.—P. S.]

† [*I. e.*, AUGUSTINE in his *later* years; for at first he referred the *petra* to the person of *Peter*. He says in his *Retractations*, i. cap. 21, at the close of his life: "I have somewhere said of St. Peter that the church is built upon him as rock. . . . But I have since frequently said that the word of the Lord: 'Thou art *Petrus*, and on this *petra* I will build my church,' must be understood of Him, whom Peter confessed as Son of the living God; and Peter, so named after this rock, represents the person of the church, which is founded on this rock and has received the keys of the kingdom of heaven. For it was not said to him: 'Thou art a rock' (*petra*), but, '*Thou art Peter*' (*Petrus*); and the rock was Christ, through confession of whom Simon received the name of Peter. Yet the reader may decide which of the two interpretations is the more probable." In the same strain he says, in another place: "Peter, in virtue of the primacy of his apostolate, stands, by a figurative generalization, for the church. . . . When it was said to him, 'I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven,' &c., he represented the whole church, which in this world is assailed by various temptations, as if by floods and storms, yet does not fall, because it is founded upon a rock, from which Peter received his name. For the rock is not so named from Peter, but Peter from the rock (*non enim a Petro petra, sed Petrus a petra*), even as Christ is not so called after the Christian, but the Christian after Christ. For the reason why the Lord says, 'On this rock I will build my church,' is that Peter had said: 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.' On this rock, which thou hast confessed, says he, I will build my church. For Christ was the rock (*petra enim erat Christus*), upon which also Peter himself was built; for other foundation can no man lay, than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ. Thus the church, which is built upon Christ, has received from Him, in the person of Peter, the keys of heaven; that is, the power of binding and loosing sins." (Aug. *Tract. in Evang. Joannis*, 124, § 5.) AMBROSE, too, at one time refers the *petra* to Christ, as when he says in Luc. ix. 20: "*Petra est Christus*," etc., but at other times to the person of Peter, as in the famous morning hymn quoted by Augustin (*Hoc ipsa petra ecclesiæ*

ers.*—2. It is referred to Peter's *confession*. Thus most of the Fathers, several Popes, Leo I., † Huss in the *Tractat. de ecclesia*, the *Articuli Smalcald.* in the *Ap-pend.*, Luther,* Febronius, and others.†—3. It is applied to *Peter* himself. (*a*) In the popish sense, by Baronius and Bellarmin, [Passaglia,] as implying that Peter was invested with a permanent primacy.‡ (*b*) With reference to the special call and work of Peter as an Apostle. By thee, Peter, as the most prominent of My witnesses, shall the Church be founded and established: Acts ii. and x. So, many Roman Catholics, as Launoi, Dupin,—and later Protestant expositors, as Werenfels, Pfaff, Bengel, and Crusius. Heubner thinks that the *antanaclasis*, or the connecting of *Peter* with πέτρα, is in favor of this view. But he [as also nearly all other commentators who represent this view] combines with it the application of the term to the confession.§—4. It is applied to Peter, *inclusive of all the other Apostles*, and, indeed, of *all believers*. Thus Origen on Matt. xvi. 18: "Every believer who is enlightened by the Father is

Canente, culpam diluit), and again to his confession, or rather to Peter *and* his confession. Comp. my *Church History*, vol. ii. p. 304. A similar apparent inconsistency we find in other fathers. The reference of the rock to Christ was also advocated by THEODORET, *ad* 1 *Cor.* iii. 11, the venerable BEDE *in Marc.* iii.: "*Petra erat Christus* (1 Cor. x. 4). *Nam Simoni qui credebat* IN PETRAM CHRISTUM, *Petri largitus est nomen;*" and even by Pope Gregory VII. in the inscription to the crown he sent to the German rival emperor Rudolph: "PETRA (*i. e.*, Christ) *dedit* PETRO (Peter), PETRUS (the pope) *diadema Rudolpho.*"—P. S.]

* [Especially CALOVIUS, of the Lutheran, and quite recently Dr. WORDSWORTH, of the Anglican, and (evidently under the influence of Wordsworth's arguments) Dr. JOS. A. ALEXANDER, of the Presbyt. Church (although the latter, as usual with him in critical passages, does not finally decide). Dr. Wordsworth rests his labored defence of the later Augustinian interpretation mainly on the difference between πέτρος, *stone*, and πέτρα, *rock*, which he thinks (referring to Lightfoot and Beveridge) had a parallel in the Syriac *Cephas* and *Cepha* (doubtful); on the fact that in the O. T. the title *Rock* is reserved to God Almighty (2 Sam. xxii. 32; Ps. xviii. 31; lxii. 2, 6, 7, etc.); and on the admitted equality of the apostles. He thus paraphrases the words of the Saviour: "'I myself, now confessed by thee to be God and Man, am the Rock of the Church. This is the foundation on which it is built.' And because St. Peter had confessed Him as such, He says to St. Peter, 'Thou hast confessed Me, and I will now confess thee; thou hast owned Me, I will now own thee; thou art Petor; *i. e.*, thou art a lively *stone*, hewn out of, and built upon Me, the living *Rock*. Thou art a genuine *Petros* of Me, the divine *Petra*. And whosoever would be a lively stone, a *Peter*, must imitate thee in this thy true confession of Me the living Rock; for upon this *Rock*, that is, on *Myself*, believed and confessed to be *both God and Man*, I will build My Church.'"—This is all true enough in itself considered, but it is no exposition of the passage. Everybody knows and admits, that in the *highest* sense of the term *Christ* and He alone is the immovable (divine) Rock of the Church, the foundation (θεμέλιος), on which the apostles built and besides which no other can be laid, 1 Cor. iii. 11; comp. 1 Cor. x. 4 (πέτρα); Matt. vii. 24, 25. But it is equally true that in a *subordinate* sense the *apostles* are called the (human) foundation on which the Church is built, Eph. ii. 20 (ἐποικοδομηθέντες ἐπὶ τῷ θεμελίῳ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ προφητῶν, κ.τ.λ.); Rev. xxi. 14 (θεμέλιοι δώδεκα, κ.τ.λ.). Now in our passage Christ appears not as rock, *i. e.*, as part of the building itself, but under a higher figure as *architect* and *Lord* of the whole spiritual temple; and the mixing of figures in one breath, as this interpretation implies, would be a plain violation of rhetorical taste and propriety such as we should not for a moment think of in connection with our Saviour. Again, the *antanaclasis* (*i. e.*, the rhetorical figure of repeating the same word in a different sense) is conclusive against this explanation. The demonstrative ταύτῃ must refer to Πέτρος, which immediately precedes; for there is not the least intimation that the Saviour, after having said: "*Thou art Rockman,*" turned away from Peter, and, pointing to Himself, continued: "*and on* THIS *rock* (*i. e.*, Myself, ἐπ' ἐμαυτῷ) *I will build My Church.*" On the contrary, He immediately continues: "*And I will give* TO THEE," καὶ δώσω σοί, which can, of course, mean nobody else but Peter. This interpretation of Augustine and Wordsworth destroys the rhetorical beauty and emphasis of the passage, and can give us no advantage whatever in our controversy with Rome, which must and can be refuted on far better grounds than forced exegesis.—P. S.]

† [This reference to the fathers is too indefinite, and hardly correct as far as Leo and the popes are concerned. The majority of the fathers, Hilary, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine. Leo I., Gregory of Nazianzen, Chrysostom, Cyril of Alexandria, Theodoret, etc., vary in their interpretation, referring the *petra* sometimes to the person of Peter, sometimes to his faith or confession, and sometimes (as Jerome and Augustine) to Christ Himself. (Comp. Maldonatus, *Comment. in quatuor Evangelistas*, ed. Martin, tom. i. p. 219 sq., and my *History of the Christian Church*, vol. ii. §§ 61 and 63, pp. 302 sqq. and 314 sqq., where the principal passages are quoted.) But this inconsistency is more apparent than real, since Peter and his faith in Christ cannot be separated in this passage. *Peter* (representing the other apostles) *as believing and confessing Christ* (but in no other capacity) is the *petra ecclesia*. This is the true interpretation, noticed by Lange sub number 3. b). Comp. my *Critical Note*, 3, p. 293. But the confession or faith *alone* cannot be meant, for two reasons: first, because this construction assumes an abrupt transition from the person to a thing and destroys the significance of the demonstrative and emphatic ταύτῃ which evidently refers to the nearest antecedent *Petros;* and secondly, because the church is not built upon abstract doctrines and confessions, but upon living persons believing and confessing the truth (Eph. ii. 20; 1 Pet. ii. 4–6; Gal. ii. 9; Rev. xxi. 14). Dr. Jos. A. Alexander, however, is too severe on this interpretation in calling it as forced and unnatural as the Roman Catholic. It undoubtedly implies an element of truth, since Peter in this passage is addressed as the bold and fearless confessor of Christ.—P. S.]

* [In Luther's *Randglosse*, but so as to combine this explanation with the fourth mentioned above (of Origen): "*Alle Christen sind Petri um der Bekenntniss willen, die hier Petrus thut, welche ist der Fels, darauf Petrus und alle Petri gebauet sind.*"—P. S.]

† [Among modern commentators EWALD, *Die drei ersten Evangelien*, p. 272, who understands, however, by πέτρα not so much the confession, as the *faith* itself which precedes it.—P. S.]

‡ [The Romish interpretation is liable to the following objections: (1) It obliterates the distinction between *petros* and *petra;* (2) it is inconsistent with the true nature of the architectural figure: the foundation of a building is one and abiding, and not constantly renewed and changed; (3) it confounds priority of time with permanent superiority of rank; (4) it confounds the apostolate, which, strictly speaking, is not transferable but confined to the original personal disciples of Christ and inspired organs of the Holy Spirit, with the post-apostolic episcopate; (5) it involves an injustice to the other apostles, who, as a body, are expressly called the foundation, or foundation stones of the church; (6) it contradicts the whole spirit of Peter's epistles, which is strongly antihierarchical, and disclaims any superiority over his "*fellow-presbyters;*" (7) finally, it rests on gratuitous assumptions which can never be proven either exegetically or historically, viz., the transferability of Peter's primacy, and its actual transfer upon the bishop, not of Jerusalem nor of Antioch (where Peter certainly was), but of Rome exclusively. Comp. also the long note to § 94 in my *History of the Apostolic Church*, p. 374 sqq.—P. S.]

§ [So also OLSHAUSEN: "Peter, in his new spiritual character, appears as the supporter of Christ's great work; Jesus Himself is the creator of the whole, Peter, the first stone of the building;" DE WETTE: "ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ, on thee as this *firm confessor;*" MEYER: "on no other but this (ταύτῃ) rock, *i. e.*, Peter, so called for his firm and strong faith in Christ;" ALFORD: "Peter was the first of those *foundation-stones* (Eph. ii. 20; Rev. xxi. 14) on which the living temple of God was built: this building itself beginning on the day of Pentecost by the laying of *three thousand living stones* on this very foundation;" D. BROWN: "not on the man Bar-jona; but on him as the heaven-taught Confessor of such a faith;" and more or less clearly, Grotius ("*Petrus a me nominatus es, quia eris quasi petra*"), Le Clerc, Whitby, Doddridge, Clarke, Bloomfield, Barnes, Eadie, Owen, Crosby (who, however, wrongly omits the reference to the confession), Whedon, Nast. I can see no material difference between this interpretation and Lange's own sub No. 5, which is only a modification or expansion of it. I have already remarked in a former note that this is the true exposition which the majority of the fathers intended, though with some inclination to the subsequent Romish application of the promise to a supposed successor.—P. S.]

also a rock."—5. In our opinion, the Lord here generalizes, so to speak, the individual Peter into the general πέτρα, referring to what may be called the Petrine characteristic of the Church—viz., *faithfulness of confession*,*—as first distinctly exhibited by Peter. Hence the words of Jesus only refer to Peter in so far as by this confession he identified himself with Christ, and was the first to upbuild the Church by his testimony. But in so far as the text alludes to an abiding foundation of the Church, the expression refers not to the Apostle as an individual, but to πέτρα in the more general sense, or to faithfulness of confession. That Peter was here meant in his higher relation, and not in himself, appears from the change of terms, first πέτρος, then πέτρα; also from the contrast in ver. 22; while the fact that his distinction conferred no official primacy is evident from this, that the same rights and privileges were bestowed upon all the Apostles: Matt. xviii. 18; John xx. 23; Eph. ii. 20; Rev. xxi. 14. That he himself claimed no preëminence appears from his First Epistle, in which he designates Christ as the corner-stone, and Christians as living stones, 1 Pet. ii. 5, 6 (as themselves Peters, or related to Peter). Lastly, that he knew of no successors in the sense of the Papacy, is proved by his exhortation to the presbyters not to be lords over God's heritage (the κλῆροι, 1 Pet. v. 3).

My Church.—Here the ἐκκλησία of Christ appears for the first time in distinct contrast to the Jewish congregation, קָהָל. Hence the passage refers not simply to a community of believers, but to a definite organization of this community (compare what follows on the keys). Accordingly, the passage alludes to the Church as the organized and visible form of the βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν. The Church is not the kingdom of heaven itself, but a positive institution of Christ by which, on the one hand, the kingdom of heaven becomes directly manifest in the world by its *worship*, while, on the other hand, it spreads through the world by means of its *missionary efforts*. The Church bears the same relation to the kingdom of heaven as the Messianic state under the Old Testament to the theocracy, the two being certainly not identical.

The gates of hades (underworld).—De Wette: "Here, equivalent to the kingdom of Satan." But this is not the scriptural conception of hades or sheol. Throughout the Bible hades means the kingdom of death; which is, indeed, connected with the kingdom of Satan, but has a more comprehensive meaning. Hades is described as having *gates*; it is figuratively represented as a castle with gates (Song viii. 6; Job xxxviii. 17; Isa. xxxviii. 10; Ps. cvii. 18). These gates serve a hostile purpose, since they opened, like a yawning abyss of death, to swallow up Christ, and then Peter, or the Apostles and the Church, in their martyrdom. For a long time it seemed as if the Church of Christ would become the prey of this destroying hades. But its gates *shall not ultimately prevail*—they shall be taken; and Christ will overcome and abolish the kingdom of death in His Church (see Isa. xxv. 8; Hos. xiii. 14; 1 Cor. xv. 15; Eph. i. 19, 20). Of course, the passage also implies conflict with the kingdom of evil, and victory over it; but its leading thought is the triumph of *life over death*, of the kingdom of the *resurrection* over the usurped reign of the kingdom of *hades*.—Erasmus, Calvin, and others, refer it to the victory over Satan; Grotius, to that over death;* Ewald, to that over all the monsters of hell, let loose through these open gates; Glöckler, to that over the machinations of the kingdom of darkness (the gate being the place of council in the East); Meyer, to the superiority of the Church over hades, without any allusion to an attack on the part of hades. The idea, that the Old Testament ἐκκλησία would fall before the gates of hades, is here evidently implied (*Leben Jesu*, ii. 2, p. 887.)

Ver. 19. **The keys of the kingdom of heaven.**—Luke xi. 52; Rev. i. 18; iii. 7; ix. 1; xx. 1. It is the prerogative of the Apostles, either to admit into the kingdom of heaven, or to exclude from it. Meyer: "The figure of the keys corresponds with the figurative expression οἰκοδομήσω in ver. 18; since in ver. 18 the ἐκκλησία, which, at Christ's second appearing, is destined to become the βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν—(as if this were not already its real, though not its open character, which at Christ's second coming shall only become outwardly manifest!)—is represented as a building. But, in reference to Peter, the figure changes from that of a rock, or foundation, to that of an οἰκονόμος; or, in other words, from the position and character of Peter to his office and work." But evidently the antithesis here presented is different from this view. Peter is designated the foundation-stone as being the first confessing member of the Church, though with an allusion to his calling; while in his official relation to the Church he is represented as guardian of the Holy City. Hence the expression, rock, refers to the nucleus of the Church as embodied in Peter; while the keys allude to the apostolic office and vocation in the Church.

[ALFORD: "Another personal promise to Peter, remarkably fulfilled in his being the first to admit both Jews and Gentiles into the Church; thus using the power of the keys to open the door of salvation." WORDSWORTH applies the promise in a primary and personal sense to Peter, but in a secondary and general sense also to the Church, and especially the ministers who hold and profess the faith of Peter and are called to preach the gospel, to administer the sacraments, and to exercise discipline. AUGUSTINE: "*Has claves non homo unus, sed unitas accepit ecclesia.*"—P. S.]

And whatsoever thou shalt bind.—A somewhat difficult antithesis, especially with reference to the preceding context. Bretschneider (Lexicon): "The expression '*binding*' means to bind with the Church; and '*loosing*,' to loose from the Church." But this is to confound ideas which are very different. Olshausen understands it of the ancient custom of tying the doors. But the text speaks of a key. Stier regards it as in accordance with rabbinical phraseology, taken from the Old Testament; *binding* and *loosing* being equivalent to *forbidding* and *permitting*, and more especially to *remitting* and *retaining* sins. But these two ideas are quite different. Lightfoot, Schöttgen, and, after them, von Ammon, hold that the expression implied three things: 1. Authority to declare a thing unlawful or lawful. Thus Meyer regards δέειν and λύειν as equivalent to the rabbinical אסר and התיר, *to forbid*, and *to permit*. 2. To pronounce an action, accordingly, as

* [*Die petrinische Bekenntnisstreue.*—P. S.]

* [Grotius has a long and learned note on the passage, and says: "*Nusquam reperis ᾅδου vocem neque apud Hellenistas neque apud novi fœderis scriptores in alia significatione quam aut mortis, aut sepulchri, aut status post mortem, quæ omnia sunt inter se affinia,*" etc.—P. S.]

criminal or innocent. 3. Thereupon to pronounce a ban or to revoke it. But as the Lord here speaks of the keys of the kingdom of heaven, He can only have referred directly to the last-mentioned meaning of the expression, though it involved the first and second, as the *sentence* of the Apostles would always be according to truth. A comparison of the parallel passage in Matt. xviii. 18 confirms this view. There *Church discipline* is enjoined on the disciples collectively, to whom precisely the same assurance is given which in the text is granted to Peter alone; while in John xx. 23 the order is reversed: the expression, *remitting* sins, being equivalent for *loosing*, and *retaining* sins, for *binding*. The whole passage forms a contrast to the ecclesiastical discipline of the Pharisees, Matt. xxiii. From the evangelical character of the New Testament ministry, it seems to us impossible to interpret the expression as meaning to *forbid* and to *permit*, according to the analogy of rabbinical usage. To bind up sins, as in a bundle, implies coming judgment (Job xiv. 17; Hos. xiii. 12); while, on the other hand, sins forgiven are described as loosed (LXX. Isa. xl. 2). Both figures are based on a deeper view of the case. When a person is refused admission into the Church, or excluded from it, all the guilt of his life is, so to speak, concentrated into one judgment; while its collective effect is removed, or loosed, when he is received into the Church, or absolved. The object of this binding and loosing is stated only in general terms. No doubt it combined all the three elements of the power of the keys, as the non-remission or remission of sins (Chrysostom and many others),—viz.: 1. The principle of admission or non-admission into the Church, or the announcement of grace and of judgment (the kingdom of heaven is closed to unbelievers, opened to believers). 2. Personal decision as to the admission of catechumens (Acts viii.). 3. The exercise of discipline, or the administration of excommunication from the Church (in the narrower sense, *i. e.*, without curse or interdict attaching thereto). In the antithesis between earth and heaven, the former expression refers to the order and organization of the visible Church; the latter, to the kingdom of heaven itself. These two elements then—the actual and the ideal Church—were to coincide in the pure administration of the Apostles. But this promise is limited by certain conditions. It was granted to Peter in his capacity as a witness, and as confessing the revelation of the Father (Acts v.), but not to Peter as wavering or declining from the truth (Matt. xvi. 23; Gal. ii.).

Ver. 20. **That they should tell no man.**—Since the people would not give up their carnal notions of a worldly millennium. The Christian acknowledgment of the Messiah was not to be mixed up with Jewish expectations. Christ's Messianic life had to be actually completed before His disciples were to testify of Him as the Christ. Nay, the Lord Himself was to be the first publicly to announce it to the people, in the hour of His martyrdom (Matt. xxvi. 64).

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. At first sight it may seem an accident that the first announcement of the Church as distinct from, and in contrast to, the State—while the ancient theocratic community combined both Church and State—should have been made in the district of Cæsarea, which owned the sway of so mild a monarch as Philip. At any rate, the event was one of universal historical importance, and may be regarded as the preparation for the feast of Pentecost.

2. In what passed between our Lord and His disciples we are led to observe,—(1) The contrast between human opinions of religion and a confession of faith prompted and evoked by the grace of God:—in the former case, fear, dejection, uncertainty, and discordance; in the latter, courage, frankness, certainty, and unity. (2) The indissoluble connection between true confession and a life of revelation and in the Spirit, or regeneration; (3) between a common confession and the formation of the visible Church; (4) between the confession of the Church to Christ and Christ's confession to the Church; (5) between the character of the first believing confessor and his official calling.

3. In the text, Peter is presented to us in a twofold relationship: (1) As Peter; (2) as receiving the keys. The former designation applied to him as the first believing confessor, the first member of the ἐκκλησία, to which others were afterward to be joined. Hence it referred to his practical life as a Christian bearing witness to Jesus, rather than to his official position in the Church. This spiritual character formed the basis of his office in the narrower sense, the main purport of which was to arrange individual believers into a community, and, by organizing a visible Church, to separate between the world and the kingdom of heaven. As being the first witness to Jesus, Peter, so to speak, laid the foundation of the Church: (1) By his confession on this occasion; (2) by his testimony, Acts ii.; (3) by his admission of the Gentiles into the Church, Acts x.; (4) by being the means of communicating to the Church the distinguishing feature of his character—fidelity of confession.

4. On the fact that the Church indelibly bears not only the characteristic of Peter, but of all the Apostles; or that all the apostolic offices are unchangeably perpetuated in it, comp. Com. on ch. x. (against Irvingism), and Schaff's *History of the Apostolic Church*, § 129, p. 516 sqq.

5. In its *apostolic nucleus, its apostolic beginning, and its apostolic depth and completeness*, the Church is so thoroughly identified with the kingdom of heaven itself, that its social determinations should in all these respects coincide with the declaration of God's Spirit. But this applies only in so far as Peter was really Peter—and hence one with Christ, or as Christ is in the Church. That there is a difference between the Church and the kingdom of heaven, which may even amount to a partial opposition, is implied in the antithesis: "*on earth*"—"*in heaven*."

6. The present occasion must be regarded as the initial foundation, not as the regular and solemn institution, of the Church. The promises given to Peter still relate to the future. For the strong faith which prompted his confession was rather a prophetic flash of inspiration (the blossom), than a permanent state of mind (the fruit). This appears from the following section.

7. In this passage Peter is represented as the foundation-stone, and Christ as the builder; while in 1 Cor. iii. 11, Christ is designated the foundation, and the Apostles the builders. "The latter figure evidently alludes to the relation between the changing and temporary laborers in the Church, and her eternal and essential character, more especially her eternal foundation; while the figurative language of

Jesus applies to the relation between the starting-point and commencement of the Church in time, her outward and temporal manifestation, and her eternal Builder." (From the author's *Leben Jesu*, ii. 2, p. 886). Richter (*Erklärte Hausbibel*, i. 157): "The Church opens the way into the kingdom of heaven. Christ built on Peter and the Apostles, not His *kingdom*, but His *Church*, which is *one*, though not the *only*, form in which Christianity manifests itself." Hence Olshausen is mistaken in regarding the ἐκκλησία as simply tantamount to the βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ.

[Wordsworth observes on the words: *they shall not prevail:* "That these words contain no promise of infallibility to St. Peter, is evident from the fact that the Holy Spirit, speaking by St. Paul in Canonical Scripture, says that he erred (Gal. ii. 11–13).* And that they do not contain any promise of infallibility to the bishop of Rome is clear, among other proofs, from the circumstance that Pope Liberius (as Athanasius relates, *Historia Arian.*, 41, p. 291) lapsed into Arianism, and Honorius was anathematized of old by Roman pontiffs as an heretic."—P. S.]

8. For special treatises on the supposed primacy of Peter, *see* Heubner, p. 236; Danz, *Universalwörterbuch*, article *Primat;* Bretschneider, *Systematische Entwicklung*, p. 796, etc.

9. On the power of the keys, *see* Heubner, p. 240; the author's *Positive Dogmatik*, p. 1182,—the literature belonging to it, p. 1196; *Berl. Kirchl. Vierteljahrsschrift*, ii. 1845, Nr. 1; Rothe, *Ethik*, iv. 1066. [Compare also Wordsworth, Alford, Brown, and the American commentators, Barnes, Alexander, Owen, Jacobus, Whedon, Nast, on ch. xvi. 19.—P. S.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The Church of Christ founded under the sentence of expulsion pronounced on Christ and His Apostles both by the Jewish Church and the State: 1. Its preparatory announcement, ch. xvi.; 2. its complete and real foundation (Golgotha); 3. its solemn institution and manifestation, Acts ii.; comp. ch. iii. and iv. and Heb. xiii. 13.—The decisive question, "Who do men say that the Son of Man" is?—Difference between opinions about Christ and the confession of Christ.—The first New Testament confession of Christ, viewed both as the fruit and as the seed of the kingdom of heaven: 1. The fruit of the painful labor and sowing of Christ; 2. the germ and seed of every future confession of Christ.—The confession of Peter an evidence of his spiritual life: 1. In its freedom and cheerful self-surrender; 2. in its decidedness; 3. in its infinite fulness; 4. in its general suitableness for all disciples.—Jesus the Christ, the Son of the living God: 1. In His nature; 2. in His mission; 3. in His work.—The joy of the Lord at the first fruits of His mission.—The confession of the Lord to His Congregation: 1. How it will continue to become more abundant even to the day of judgment. ("Whosoever shall confess Me," etc.) 2. What it imports. (The blessedness of Simon in his character as Peter.)—The Son of the living God acknowledging those who are begotten of the Father as His own relatives and brethren.—The life of faith of Christians ever a revelation of the Father in heaven.—Genuine confession a fruit of regeneration.—The rock on which Christ has founded His Church, or Peter in a spiritual sense, is faithfulness of confession (*Bekenntnisstreue*).—Fidelity of confession the first characteristic mark of the Church.—Relation between Christ, the Rock of the kingdom of heaven, the corner-stone of the everlasting Church, and the rock-foundation on which His visible Church on earth is reared: 1. In the one case, the Apostles are the builders, and Christ the rock and corner-stone; 2. in the other case, the Apostles are the foundation, and Christ the builder.—Only when resting on that rock which is Christ will His people become partakers of the same nature.—How the Church of Christ will endure forever, in spite of the gates of Hades.—The old, legal, and typical Church, and the new Church of the living Saviour, in their relation to the kingdom of death: 1. The former is overcome by the kingdom of death; 2. the latter overcomes the kingdom of death.—Complete victory of Christ's kingdom of life over the kingdom of death.—First Peter, then the keys; or, first the Christian, then the office.—The power of the keys as a spiritual office: 1. *Its infinite importance:* announcement of the statutes of the kingdom of heaven; decision respecting the admission and continuance [of members]; or, in its threefold bearing—(*a*) on the hearers of the word generally, (*b*) on catechumens, and (*c*) on communicants. 2. *The conditions of its exercise:* a living confession, of which Christ is the essence; readiness to bind as well as to loose, and *vice versâ*, the ratification of the kingdom of heaven.—The keys of the prisons of the Inquisition, and of the coffers of Indulgences,* as compared with the keys of the kingdom of heaven; or, the difference between the golden and the iron keys.—The confession of faith kept as a secret from the enemies of Christ.—The preparatory festival of the New Covenant.

Starke:—It is useful, and even necessary, for preachers to be aware of the erroneous fancies which are in vogue among their hearers on the subject of religion.—*Cramer:* Every man should be able to give an account of his faith, John xvii. 3.—The discordant thoughts respecting the person of Christ.—*Majus:* The just must live by his own faith.—*Osiander:* Be not vacillating, but assured in your own minds.—*Jerome: Quemadmodum os loquitor pro toto corpore, sic Petrus lingua erat Apostolorum et pro omnibus ipse respondit.*—The other two confessions of Peter, Matt. xiv. 33; John vi. 68.—If we acknowledge Christ aright in our heart, we shall also freely confess Him with our mouth, Rom. x. 10.—The divine and human natures combined in the person of Christ.—Blessedness of faith.—To know Christ is to be saved, John xvii. 3.—*Quesnel:* True blessedness: 1. It consists not in the advantages of birth, nor in natural gifts, nor in riches, nor in reputation and dignity; but, 2. in the possession of the gifts of grace through Christ.—*Hedinger:* All true faith is the gift of God.—*Osiander:* If the truth of God is mixed up with human fancies, it does more harm than good.—Let no one hastily talk of the

* [But this was only an error of conduct, not of doctrine; and hence proves nothing against the inspiration of the apostles, nor the pretended infallibility of their successors.—P. S.]

* [In German: *Die Inquisitionskerkerschlüssel und Ablasskastenschlüssel.* The Edinb. transl. mixes these two distinct ideas into one by rendering: "*The keys of the prisons and indulgences of the Inquisition.*" The coffers of the indulgences, according to the scholastic doctrine, are filled with the treasures of the so called supererogatory works and merits of canonized saints from which the popes can dispense extraordinary indulgences or remissions of sins. It was this trade in papal indulgences carried on by a monkish quack or humbug, Tetzel, which gave rise (as the external occasion, but not as the cause which lay far deeper) to the Lutheran Reformation.—P. S.]

good which he has received, but let him first make experiment of its reality, Eccles. v. 1.

Gerlach:—The Christian Church possesses this power of the keys, not in its outward capacity or organization, but in so far as the Spirit rules in it. Hence, whenever it is exercised as a merely outward law, without the Spirit, the Lord in His providence disowns these false pretensions of the visible Church.

Heubner:—In order to be decided, and to become our own faith, we must publicly profess it.—How little value attaches to the opinions of the age on great men! *—The independence of Christians of prevalent opinions.—Peter's confession not his faith only, but that of all disciples, John vi. 68.—Peter's confession the collective confession of the Apostles.—See what value Christ sets on this faith.—It is impossible for any man, even though he were an apostle, to impart faith to another. This is God's prerogative.

* [Not: *How much great men are influenced by the opinions of the age*, as the Edb. trsl., misled by the German *wie viel* (which must be understood *ironically*), reverses the meaning of the original, thus making Heubner contradict himself in the next sentence. Heubner alludes to the confused and contradictory opinions of the Jews concerning Christ, ver. 15, and then contrasts with them the firm conviction of faith in Peter, ver. 16. Great men, during their lifetime, meet with the very opposite judgments at the bar of ever-changing popular opinion, and they are not truly great unless they can rise above it and quietly pursue the path of duty, leaving the small matter of their own fame in the hands of a just God and of an approciating posterity which will judge them by the fruits of their labor.—P. S.]

B. *The Church as bearing the Cross of Christ, in contrast to that worldly fear of the Cross by which the Lord is assailed.* CH. XVI. 21–28.

(Mark viii. 31–ix. 1; Luke ix. 21–28).

21 From that time forth[1] began Jesus to show unto [to] his disciples, how[2] that he
must go unto [to] Jerusalem, and suffer many things of [from] the elders, and chief
priests, and scribes, and be killed [put to death], and be raised again [rise][3] the third
22 day. Then Peter took him,[4] and began[5] to rebuke him, saying, Be it far from thee,
23 Lord: this shall not be unto thee. But he turned,[6] and said unto [to] Peter, Get thee
behind me, Satan;[7] thou art an offence unto me [my offence]:[8] for thou savourest
24 [mindest] not the things that be [are] of God, but those that be [are] of men.[9] Then
said Jesus unto [to] his disciples, If any *man* [one] will come after me, let him deny
25 himself, and take up his cross, and follow me. For whosoever will save his life shall
26 lose it; and whosoever will [may] lose his life for my sake shall find it. For what is a
man profited [will a man be profited],[10] if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his
27 own[11] soul? or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul? For the Son of man
shall come in the glory of his father, with his angels; and then he shall reward every
28 man according to his works. Verily I say unto you, There be [are] some standing here[12]
which [who] shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom.

1 Ver. 21.—[*Forth* is unnecessary and may be omitted. The Greek is ἀπὸ τότε.—P. S.]

2 Ver. 21.—[Better: *that*, ὅτι, without *how*, which dates from Tyndale.—P. S.]

3 Ver. 21.—[The Vulgate correctly translates *resurgere;* Luther, Ewald, and Lange: *auferstehen, rise;* taking ἐγερθῆναι in the middle sense, as in ch. viii. 15, 26 (ἠγέρθη, *she arose*); ix. 6 (*arise*); xvii. 7 (*arise*); xxv. 7 (*arose*); xxvi. 46; xxvii. 52, 64, etc. Wiclif, Tyndale, and the Genevan Bible had it correctly: *to rise again;* but Cranmer changed it into the passive, and this was retained in King James's version, although the intervening Bishops' Bible (ed. 1583) followed the older rendering.—P. S.]

4 Ver. 22.—[Προσλαβόμενος may be rendered: *taking hold of him* (English Vers. and Lange), or *taking him aside*, to himself, apart from others (Euthym. Zigab., Ewald, Meyer, Conant). The first is stronger. *See* the *Exeg. Notes*.—P. S.]

5 Ver. 22.—Ἤρξατο. The difference of readings is here important. Cod. B. omits ἤρξατο and reads: λέγει αὐτῷ ἐπιτιμῶν. Cod. D. and others: ἤρξατο αὐτῷ ἐπιτιμᾶν καὶ λέγειν. Similarly the *text. rec.* [Cod. Sinait. reads, like the *text. rec.:* ηρξατο επιτιμαν αυτω λεγων. So also Tischendorf and Lachmann (except that the latter places αὐτῷ before ἐπιτιμᾶν); while Alford here follows the reading of Cod. Vaticanus, omitting ἤρξατο. This verb implies that the Lord interrupted Peter and prevented him from finishing the rebuke.—P. S.]

6 Ver. 23.—[Or, *turned round*, ἐπιστραφείς, as Lange reads, following D., K., L., etc., instead of the *lect. rec.* στραφείς.—P. S.]

7 Ver. 23.—[*Satan* is the proper translation of the Vulgate (*satana*), and nearly all the English and German versions, and is not to be weakened into the more general *adversary*. The word occurs 34 times in the N. T. (generally with the art., sometimes without it), and is always the Hebrew proper name for the *Devil*, ὁ διάβολος, the Prince of evil. *See Exeg. Note*.—P. S.]

8 Ver. 23.—[So Lange: *du bist mein Aergerniss*, literally according to the reading of the *text. rec.:* σκάνδαλόν μου εἶ (Tischendorf), or εἶ ἐμοῦ (Lachmann following Cod. Vaticanus, with which here, as very often, Cod. Sinaiticus agrees). Εἶ ἐμοί, and the Lat. Vulgate: *scandalum es mihi*, is more mild and looks like a later modification. Lachmann's text here (ἐμοῦ) is the same in sense with the received text (μου).—P. S.]

9 Ver. 23.—[Οὐ φρονεῖς τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀλλὰ τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, *thou art not minded like God but like men*, or *thou art not of the mind of God, but of men*, or *thou mindest not the things of God, but of men.* Lange: *du denkest nicht auf das was Gottes ist*, etc.; Ewald: *du sinnest nicht was Gottes, sondern was der Menschen.* All Eng-

lish versions from Wiclif to James have *savorest*. This is a Latinism from *sapere* and the Vulgate rendering: *non sapis ea quæ Dei sunt*, and must not be taken in the usual sense of the transitive verb *to savor*, *i. e.*, *to relish*, *to delight in*. Campbell makes it too strong by translating: *relishest*.—P. S.]

[10] Ver. 26.—The future ὠφεληθήσεται is strongly attested by Codd. B., L., al., against ὠφελεῖται, but may be conformed to the following δώσει. [Ὠφεληθήσεται is also sustained by Cod. Sinait., and adopted by Tischendorf, Lachmann, Tregelles, and Alford.—P. S.]

[11] Ver. 26.—[*Own* is an unnecessary addition, and implies a contrast to another man's soul.—P. S.]

[12] Ver. 28 —Τῶν ὧδε ἑστώτων, warranted by B., C., D., etc.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 21. **From that time.**—From the first Jesus had given obscure intimations of the sorrows which were before Him: John ii. 4, etc. Now, however, He made a distinct announcement of the precise form of His sufferings; 1. because the disciples were strong enough in faith to bear this intelligence; 2. because their faith in the Messiah would thereby be effectually guarded from the admixture of carnal Jewish notions; 3. because the Lord could not conceal from His disciples what awaited them, and would have none but voluntary followers on His path of suffering. But Christ not only announced His impending sufferings; He also explained and showed their necessity—it was a δεικνύειν ὅτι δεῖ, although interrupted by the remonstrance of the disciples.

Of the elders.—The detailed enumeration of these parties proves that there was a general conspiracy on the part of all the Jewish authorities, and hence indicates the rupture of the whole outward theocracy with Christianity.

And rise again the third day.—Even Meyer considers it impossible to reconcile so clear and distinct a prediction of the resurrection with the circumstance that the disciples were so much disheartened by the Lord's death, as not to expect His restoration to life, and that they did not know what to think of the empty sepulchre, etc. Accordingly, this critic assumes, with Hasert, Neander, de Wette, and others, that Christ had on this occasion indicated His resurrection in a much more indefinite manner than in the text, and that this intimation had assumed the shape of a distinct prediction only *ex eventu*, and from tradition. Süsskind, Heydenreich, Kuinoel, Ebrard, and others, regard, on the other hand, the narrative in the text as an accurate account of what took place at the time. (*See* also *Leben Jesu*, ii. 2, p. 894.) Nor can we see any difficulty in regard to the later conduct of the disciples. As they evidently did not receive Christ's announcement of His impending death, we cannot wonder at their failing to apprehend and remember what He had said of His resurrection. Besides, until the day of Pentecost, they were very doubtful expositors of the words of Jesus; the figurative and symbolical language employed often leaving them uncertain what to take in a literal and what in a symbolical sense. Hence they frequently explained figurative expressions literally, Matt. xvi. 7; John iv. 33, xi. 12; while, on the other hand, they understood literal expressions figuratively, John vi. 70; Matt. xv. 15–17. Accordingly, in this instance also the disciples seem to have remained in doubt in what sense the Lord uttered this solemn and mysterious saying, and that even after He had repeated it a second time, Mark ix. 10. Their uncertainty was all the greater from the state of their minds, which assumed an attitude of opposition whenever the Lord made such disclosures. Hence, we conceive that the ἤρξατο of the Lord ("He *began* to show them," etc.) was interrupted by the vehement remonstrance of Peter, just as Peter's attempted rebuke was interrupted by the Lord's reproof. In all these instances, we must not picture to ourselves the Lord as delivering lectures *ex cathedrâ* to His disciples, but as making disclosures and revelations which caused intense commotion. Besides, the statement that the disciples gave way to despair after the death of Jesus, is quite contrary to the account of the Evangelists. The honorable interment, the anointing of the corpse (which must not be regarded as identical with the Egyptian practice of embalming), their meetings, and their going to the grave, sufficiently show that there were gleams of light in their darkest hours. On the other hand, their doubts in regard to the resurrection—even after they had been informed of it—are explained by the prodigious greatness both of the anticipation and of the reality. (The idea, that the language of Jesus was symbolical, and referred to a fresh impulse to be given to His cause, scarcely requires refutation.)

Ver. 22. **Then Peter took Him;**—προσλαβόμενος.—He laid his hand upon Him, or seized Him from behind, as if he would have moved Him by main force to alter His purpose. He stopped the Master in this manner for the purpose of remonstrating with Him. Grotius explains it: he embraced Him; Euthymius Zigabenus and Meyer: he took Him aside, κατ' ἰδίαν. The account says nothing of either. When Jesus turned round, He addressed Himself not only to Peter, but also to the other disciples; for, as in his confession, so at this time, Peter represented the general feeling. Meyer rightly infers from the expression ἤρξατο, that Jesus did not allow Peter to finish his address. But we see no reason to conclude that He turned His back upon Peter; the expression, ὁ δὲ στραφείς, or ἐπιστραφείς (as in Mark), being rather against this supposition. Jesus turned round to Peter and the other disciples; and the command, ὕπαγε ὀπίσω μου, referred to the fact, that in a spiritual sense Peter was attempting to obstruct His path.

Be it far from Thee.—*This shall not happen to thee*, Ἵλεώς σοι, a proverbial expression, εἴη ὁ Θεός being understood: *Propitius sit tibi Deus*, *God be merciful to thee*, *God preserve thee!*—equivalent to the Hebrew חָלִילָה (2 Sam. xx. 20; xxiii. 17, lxx). [The sudden change in Peter from a bold confessor of Christ and rock of His Church, to an adversary and stumbling-block of His Master, although unaccountable on the mythical or legendary fiction-theory of Strauss or Renan, is nevertheless true to life, and easily explained and understood in view of the sanguine, impulsive, and ardent temper of Peter, and in view of the high praise and lofty promise just bestowed upon him, which was a strong temptation to his natural vanity and ambition. The experience of believers confirms the frequent occurrence of the same sudden transition. As there is but one step from the sublime to the ridiculous, from the tragical to the comical, so also in spiritual life opposite extremes often meet, and Satan is most busy to seduce us, when we are most highly exalted and favored by Christ.—P. S.]

Ver. 23. **Get thee** [lit.: *go, begone*] **behind Me** [*out of My sight, away from Me*], **Satan.**—Ὕπαγε ὀπίσω μου. *See* ch. iv. 10; Luke iv. 8, where Christ uses the same words to Satan in the wilderness. The expression *Satan* is here used in a more general sense, denoting an *Adversary*, or *Tempter*, with an allusion to the satanic element which was unconsciously at work in Peter, and tempted the Saviour away from His true calling and path of duty. The meaning therefore is: "What, is Satan come again to tempt Me, as he did of old? Get thee hence, thou Tempter!" It is scarcely necessary to say that it was not meant as a term of reproach or as a mere expression of abhorrence or contempt. Most Roman Catholic critics adopt the suggestion of Hilary, and maintain that only the first words (*Go out of My sight*) were addressed to Peter, and the rest (from *Satan*) to the personal Devil.* Maldonatus takes the term "Satan" in the general sense of *adversarius*, which may be admitted, provided we keep in mind that there was an allusion to Satan himself. As Judas afterward became permanently and consciously, so Peter now became momentarily and unconsciously, a representative of the cause of Satan, who would fain have banished the cross and the kingdom of Christ. In opposition to this, Christ chose the cross as conformable to the divine purpose, as the manifestation of His righteousness, and as the basis of His redemption.

Thou art an offence unto Me.—According to the better reading: **My** offence, or **My** stumbling-block,† σκάνδαλόν μου, which is stronger than ἐμοί (*a* stumbling-block **to Me**). The word σκάνδαλον, a later form of σκανδάληθρον, *a trap-stick;* hence a snare, or generally, an obstruction in the way, especially in a metaphorical sense.

Thou mindest (*carest for*) **the things of God,** τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ.—The things of God as represented by the will of Christ. The antithesis to this: **the things of men,** τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων. It deserves notice that human depravity is always expressed by the plural, and not the singular. If the singular is used, the epithet παλαιός is added to ἄνθρωπος. The reason is obvious. Human nature is not represented as in itself opposed to God, but only in its present state. The general meaning of the passage is: On this occasion thou thinkest not of what is conformable to the holy counsel of God, but to the sinful inclination of men. Its special application is: Thou rejectest the counsel of Him who has determined to make the cross and its sufferings the ground of salvation, and payest homage to the carnal views and expectations of the Jews concerning a secular kingdom of the Messiah.

Ver. 24. **If any man will come after Me.**—This declaration throws light both upon the statement of Christ and the counter-statement of Peter. The impending sufferings of Christ would certainly involve the disciples in similar persecutions and trials, though perhaps not immediately or outwardly. Hence they were unfit to follow Him; nor could He employ them, unless they were ready and willing wholly to surrender themselves to Him, and to suffer for His sake. To follow Jesus requires both inward self-renunciation and an outward manifestation of it, in willing submission to whatever sufferings may befall us as disciples. This renunciation must amount to self-denial, that is, it must become complete abnegation and surrender of our selfish nature and of our self-will. The expression **deny himself** forms a solemn prophetic contrast to Peter's later denial of his Lord. **Taking up the cross** was a proverbial expression; but in this connection referred to readiness to endure even the most painful and ignominious death in following Christ. At the same time, it also alluded to the Lord's crucifixion, and may be taken as a typical expression for the later death on the cross of Peter himself. *See* Matt. x. 38; John xxi.

Here, as at an earlier period of His history, when the first signs of persecution and of popular defection appeared, the Lord left it to the free choice of His disciples whether or not they would continue to follow Him.

Ver. 25. **For whosoever will save his life.**—Comp. ch. x. 39 (p. 198). Words these of the deepest import, embodying the fundamental principle both of the hidden and mystical, as well as of the outward and temporal life of a Christian. The fear of death subjects to the bondage of death, Heb. ii. 15; while readiness to suffer a holy death for Christ's sake opens up before us true life. This is our watchword in baptism, Rom. vi.; and, indeed, in all our Christianity.

Ver. 26. **For what is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose (forfeit,** ζημιωθῇ) **his own soul?**—If his soul be forfeited by this bargain. The explanation, "and *damage*," or "*injure*, his own soul,"* falls entirely short of the meaning of the expression. The following four propositions are implied in the statement of the text, which is intended to show that a man will lose his life except he follows Christ: 1. Whoever seeks to save his life by ungodly means, wishes

* [Maldonatus, who dwells at great length on vers. 18 and 19 (pp. 217–224), disposes of ver. 23 very briefly. He refers the term *Satan* correctly to Peter, but in a wider sense, and accounts for the severity by the importance of the subject, not by the guilt of Peter: *At cur tam acriter reprehendit? non tam quod Petri culpa, si qua tamen fuit, quam quod rei, de qua agebatur, magnitudo merebatur.* Schegg, one of the latest Roman Catholic commentators (*Die heil. Evang.*, Munich, 1857, vol. ii. p. 376) admits in strong language the awful severity of the rebuke, one of the severest ever uttered, but gets over the difficulty by three considerations: (1) that the rebuke was intended for all the apostles, whom Peter presented in their aversion to Christ's suffering, as before in his faith (which is correct); (2) that the primacy promised in ver. 18 was not yet actually conferred on him (which admits the force of the rebuke); (3) that the transfer of the primacy does not create a new man (which admits the possibility of the pope's falling under the same condemnation as Peter). Bengel, in his *Gnomon*, warns Rome: "*Videat Petra romana, ne cadat sub censuram versus 23.*" —P. S.]

† [Or *stumbling-stone*, which would be in keeping with the metaphorical *Petros*, a *foundation-stone*. Compare λίθος προσκόμματος καὶ πέτρα σκανδάλου, *a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence*, as Peter himself calls Christ for those who are disobedient, while to them who believe He is the chief corner stone, elect and precious. 1 Pet. ii. 7.—P. S.]

* [As Luther has it in his version: *Schaden nehmen* or *leiden* AN *seiner Seele*, instead of *seine Seele einbüssen*, or *ihrer verlustig werden*, *animæ detrimentum pati* (Vulg.), *to suffer the loss of his soul* (or his higher *life*), *to forfeit it*, as a penalty for a fault or a crime. This is the true force of ζημιωθῇ, which should be translated *forfeit*, to distinguish it from the more general term ἀπολέσῃ, ver. 25. Comp. the parallel passage, Luke ix. 25: ἑαυτὸν ἀπολέσας ἢ ζημιωθείς, *having lost or forfeited himself*, *i. e.*, his whole being. Ψυχή in this connection, of course, does not mean, as in ver. 25, the perishing life of the body (which a man can not lose and at the same time gain the whole world), but the true eternal life of the soul, which begins in this world by faith in Christ and will be fully developed in the world to come. The word ψυχή has the double meaning *life* and *soul*, for which there is no corresponding term in English or German.—P. S.]

for a portion of worldly gain. 2. But to gain the world (as such) in a selfish and sinful manner, implies the loss of the soul. 3. This loss is infinitely greater than even the gain of the whole world, assuming that such were possible. 4. In truth, whoever has lost his own soul for the world has gained even the world only in appearance, but lost it in reality.

Or what shall a man give in exchange [lit.: **as an exchange**] **for his soul** (ἀντάλλαγμα ψυχῆς).—A proof that the loss of the soul is perpetual and irreparable. If a man loses his soul, he can find no equivalent for it within the whole range of the apparent possessions of this world, by which to ransom it from its bondage unto death. Ἀντάλλαγμα, properly *counter-price*. The price which a man gives is the ἄλλαγμα; the *counter-price* which a man receives is the ἀντάλλαγμα. Hence the expression, *giving* an ἀντάλλαγμα (not *taking* it), must imply the idea: "if the bargain should be broken off." This is, indeed, possible in secular transactions, but not when a man has bartered his soul for the world; since, in point of fact, he has gained only an illusory demoniacal image or likeness of the world, not the world itself (*see Leben Jesu*, ii. 2, p. 899).*—The Lord here shows that the desire and endeavor of gaining the world really lay at the root of the carnal Messianic hopes of the Jews, as, indeed, had already appeared in the third temptation by which He was assailed at the commencement of His course, Matt. iv. A caricature this of the real κληρονομία.

The next verse shows that the Lord referred not merely to a *negative* damage, but also to a positive punishment.

Ver. 27. **For it shall come to pass that the Son of Man shall come.**—Μέλλει γάρ. [Emphatically placed at the beginning of the sentence.] Not a simple future, but meaning: the event is impending that He shall come, He is about to come. On this second advent, *see* ch. xxiv., xxv.; 2 Thess. ii.; Rev. xix., xx., etc.—**In the glory of His Father.**—Not merely as the representative of the Father in the judgment which is to be executed, but as the Founder of a new world, the Centre and Author of the new creation (παλιγγενεσία). **He will reward every man according to his work,**—πρᾶξιν, or the total outward manifestation of his inner life as a believer or unbeliever. This reference to the second advent is specially intended to prove the former statement: "*Whosoever will lose his life for My sake shall find it.*"

Ver. 28. **There are some of those standing here.**—[The twelve then present, and immediately addressed, and the crowd referred to, Mark viii. 34.] Various explanations of this difficult passage have been offered. 1. Chrysostom and many others hold that the limit, *until they see the Son of Man coming*, etc., refers to the history of the Transfiguration, immediately following. 2. Grotius, Capellus, Wetstein, Ebrard, [Alford, Owen], etc., apply it to the destruction of Jerusalem and the founding of the Church. 3. Dorner interprets it of the conquests and progress of the gospel. 4. Meyer and others apply the expression to the proximity of the second advent itself, and assume that the disciples understood in a literal sense, and hence misunderstood, Christ's figurative statements about His ideal advent. 5. De Wette seems in the main to agree with the opinions of Grotius, Wetstein, sub (2.): "According to Mark and Luke, Christ merely predicted the advent of His kingdom." But we question whether Mark ix. 1 can be separated from viii. 38, or Luke ix. 27 from ver. 26. 6. In our opinion, it is necessary to distinguish between the advent of Christ in the glory of His kingdom within the circle of His disciples, and that same advent as applying to the world generally and for judgment. The latter is what is generally understood by the second advent; the former took place when the Saviour rose from the dead and revealed Himself in the midst of His disciples. Hence the meaning of the words of Jesus is: The moment is close at hand when your hearts shall be set at rest by the manifestation of My glory; nor will it be the lot of all who stand here to die during the interval. The Lord might have said that only two of that circle would die till then, viz., Himself and Judas. But in His wisdom He chose the expression, "some standing here shall not taste of death," to give them exactly that measure of hope and earnest expectation which they needed.*

Taste of death.—Γεύεσθαι θανάτου, a rabbinical, Syriac, and Arabic mode of expression; death being represented under the figure of a bitter cup or goblet.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *See* the preceding *Exegetical Notes.*

2. *The prediction of Christ's death.*—Two points here require to be kept in view: 1. The difference of the times when, and 2. the difference of the persons to whom, Jesus spoke. The more obscure intimations took place at an earlier period, and were made to a wider circle of Christ's hearers. Hence also they are more frequently recorded under these circumstances in the Gospel of John. But, after the last decisive events, Jesus made the most full and clear disclosures on this subject within the circle of His disciples. Nor could He have concealed His impending death from the disciples, when the Pharisees had so manifestly laid snares for Him over the whole land.

3. *The prospect of the resurrection on the third day.*—The progressive clearness with which it was announced, was closely connected with the prophecies of the Old Testament. It is a mere sophism on the part of certain critics to maintain that Jesus should at once have derived full knowledge of it either from the Old Testament or from His own supernatural consciousness. Christ was conscious of embodying in His person the fulfilment of the Old Testament.

* [Comp. J. A. Alexander *in loc.*: "The Lord pursues the awful supposition further, to the verge of paradox and contradiction, but with terrible advantage to the force of this transcendent argument. . . . A man may lose his present life and yet live on and have a better life in lieu of it; but when he loses his eternal life, he is himself lost, lost forever, and the thought of compensation or recovery involves a contradiction."—P. S.]

* [A. Barnes refers the passage to the day of Pentecost and the founding of the church. J. A. Alexander gives it a more general and indefinite application to the gradual and progressive establishment of Christ's kingdom, especially the effusion of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost, and the destruction of Jerusalem, as the two salient points, between which, as those of its inception and consummation, lies the lingering death of the Mosaic dispensation, and the gradual erection of Messiah's kingdom. This is the last passage of Scripture on which the lamented Dr. Jos. Addison Alexander of Princeton commented in full. Of the remaining chapters of the Gospel of Matthew he left, a few days before his death in 1860, merely a meagre analysis, "as though he anticipated the approaching interruption of his earthly labors."—P. S.]

In its pages He found everywhere indications of the progressive experience of His life, or of His humiliation and exaltation. In the most general manner this principle was embodied in the history of the covenant-people itself. But the curve of humiliation and exaltation seemed always to become stronger, the more exalted the life of those who occupied prominent places in the theocracy. With these saints of old, it seemed to descend into ever lower and more awful depths, and again equally to rise into more glorious heights. This contrast, which appeared distinctly even in the history of Abraham, came out more fully in his successors—in Jacob, Joseph, Moses, David, and Elijah. But Christ would not only discover this fundamental principle in the history of the Jewish people and its most prominent representatives, but also trace it in numberless features of Old Testament history: in the Book of Psalms, in the types of the law, and in the utterances of the prophets. It seemed as if this curve were the distinguishing characteristic of things great and small. Thus every page of the Old Testament would convey to the Lord not only the certainty of His death, but also the assurance of His resurrection; just as the fundamental idea of the pointed arch may be traced in every part of a Gothic cathedral. But how could Jesus predict that He would rise *on the third day?* Hasert (*on the Predictions of Christ concerning His death and resurrection*) replies: "According to the regular course of nature, in the process of the separation between soul and body, the absence of all traces of life during three days, is regarded as an evidence of death." But Christ was assured in the Spirit that He should not see corruption (Ps. xvi.; Acts ii. 27, 31). Thus He drew from the depth of His theanthropic consciousness evidence, explanation, and assurance of the types and predictions of the Old Testament—all these being sealed, as it were, by the administration of His Father in the experiences of His life.—(On the remarks of Strauss against the predictions of Jesus, *see* Ebrard, p. 540.)

4. When the Lord informed His disciples about His approaching sufferings, He at the same time announced to them His return in glory. In doing this, He might well set before them His approaching advent in the resurrection in the full glory of His final advent at the end of the world, since to believers His resurrection implied His final advent, *being the principle of His full glory*. Comp. the concluding discourses of Jesus in the Gospel according to John; and Phil. ii. 6–11. We also observe a distinct gradation in these revelations: Matt. xvi. 21; xvii. 22, 23; xx. 18, 19; xxvi. 2.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

How the Lord purifies the enthusiasm of His disciples for the approaching kingdom of the Messiah, by directing their thoughts to His path of suffering. —From the knowledge of the Divine Messiah to that of the suffering Saviour is a great step.—Connection between confession and the path of the cross.—The New Testament Church and the preaching of the cross commenced at the same moment.—Peter the first confessor of Jesus, and His first tempter on the path of suffering.—How the Spirit of Christ is reflected in His disclosures respecting His impending sufferings: 1. His divine clearness of vision, surveying the whole way. 2. His wisdom: hitherto a sparing indication; now disclosures adapted to the knowledge of His disciples. 3. His faithfulness: they are to follow Him freely and voluntarily. 4. His certainty of victory: on the third day.—Why the disciples had not rightly received the saying about the resurrection.—Only that man *can* believe in the resurrection who is *willing* to believe in the cross of Christ.—The quick relapse of Peter from divine power into human weakness.—Still, despite all his relapses, he was Peter.—The spurious imitation of Peter during the progress of the history of the Church: 1. Seizing the Lord; obstructing His path; abounding in protestations; simulating love. 2. Shunning the cross; loving the world.—Peter set by the Lord before the Church as a warning example.—How Peter anticipated his destiny.—He wished to bind the Lord Himself, but to loose the world.—How he shut himself out, while seizing in a carnal spirit the keys of the kingdom of heaven.—The leading element in Peter's mistaken advice: 1. It was the device of men, in opposition to the good pleasure of God; 2. love to the human Messiah instead of faith in the Son of God; 3. attachment to life, in opposition to the right way of life; 4. hoping for the inheritance of the world, in opposition to the inheritance of the kingdom of heaven.—The address to the disciples with which the Lord entered on His path of suffering: 1. Its divine clearness: the whole path is traced out. 2. Its heavenly decision: whoever obstructed His path was a Satan. 3. Its holy summons: "If any man will come after Me." 4. The foundation and ground of this call: "What shall it profit a man?" 5. The promises connected with it: "the Son of man in the glory of His Father." 6. The gracious comfort: "There are some standing here."—Self-denial the preliminary condition of following Jesus.—Following the Lord on the path of suffering: 1. Its commencement: confession of Jesus; denial of self. 2. Its course: looking up to the Lord, who goeth before; taking up the cross. 3. Its goal: transitory sufferings with Jesus; eternal glory with Him.—If in life we die with Christ, we shall in dying live with Him.—Whoever in life partakes of the cup of Christ's death, will in death drink abundantly of the cup of His life.

Starke:—*Zeisius:* Christ the pattern of Christian teachers, as gradually and carefully progressing from the easier to the more difficult lessons.—*Hedinger:* Christ must suffer, and thus enter into glory, Luke xxiv. 26.—The doctrines of Christ's sufferings and resurrection must always be conjoined.—A mere good opinion is not sufficient.—*Canstein:* Our best friends, so far as this world is concerned, are often our greatest enemies in spiritual and heavenly matters.—To the carnal men of the world, the crucified Saviour is still either a stumbling-block, or else foolishness, 1 Cor. i. 23; 2 Cor. x. 4, 5.—*Hedinger:* Be not lifted up by knowledge or prosperity: how easily mayest thou fall, and from an angel become a Satan! —*Zeisius:* All carnal wisdom which opposeth itself to the word and will of God, is only devilish, however great or plausible it may appear.—*Majus:* If the truth is at stake, we must not spare our dearest friends.—If we do not deny ourselves, we cannot bear the cross.—It is the duty of believers to die unto self and to live unto Christ.—*Majus:* What appears to us to be gain, must be regarded as loss for Christ's sake, Phil. iii. 7, 8.—*Quesnel:* The loss of the soul can never be repaired.—If thou sufferest injustice at a human tribunal, wait with confidence for the future righteous judgment of Christ.

Lisco:—After death, the resurrection. Through

death to life; through shame to glory; by the cross to the crown; through defeat to victory! Thus Christ, and thus His people.—Suffering is inseparable from following Christ.—To take up the cross denotes our readiness to suffer.—Fear of suffering is fatal.—Glorious reward of grace which will follow suffering.

Gerlach:—Confession and suffering must go together.

Heubner:—Human wisdom would dissuade us from making sacrifices for the sake of duty.—Jesus regarded and treated every one as Satan who wished to turn Him aside from His heavenly mission.—To dissuade from duty is not friendship, but seduction. —*Luther*: What is the Papacy at the present day, but the carnal kingdom which the Jews expect from the Messiah!—As with Christ, so with His followers, the path to exaltation is through humiliation.—Christ's frankness in announcing the fate of His disciples.—The Christian's mode of calculation.—The loss of what is eternal cannot be compensated by the gain of earthly possessions.—The future is no illusion.

[*On the infinite value and possible loss of the soul*, ver. 26.—*M. Henry*: 1. Every man has a soul of his own; 2. it is possible for the soul to be lost, and there is danger of it; 3. if the soul is lost, it is the sinner's own losing, and his blood is on his own head; 4. one soul is more worth than all the world; so the winning of the world is often the losing of the soul; 6. the loss of the soul cannot be made up by the gain of the whole world; 7. if the soul be once lost, it is lost forever, and the loss can never be repaired or retrieved.—P. S.]

C. *The Church as a Spiritual Communion, in opposition to the Solitary Tabernacles of Spurious Separation from the World.* Ch. XVII. 1–9.

(*The Gospel for the 6th Sunday after Epiphany.*—Parallels: Mark ix. 2–9; Luke ix. 28–36.)

1 And after six days Jesus taketh Peter, [and, καί] James, and John his brother, and
2 bringeth them up into an high mountain apart,[1] And [he] was transfigured before them:
and his face did shine [shone][2] as the sun, and his raiment [garments] was [became,
3 ἐγένετο] white as the light. And, behold, there appeared[3] unto them Moses and Elias
4 [Elijah] talking with him. Then answered Peter, and said unto Jesus, Lord, it is good
for us to be here: if thou wilt, let us make [I will make][4] here three tabernacles; one
5 for thee, and one for Moses, and one for Elias [Elijah]. While he yet spake [was yet
speaking], behold, a bright [luminous, φωτεινή] cloud[5] overshadowed them: and behold
a voice out of the cloud, which said [saying, λέγουσα], This is my beloved Son, in
6 whom I am well pleased; hear ye him. And when the disciples heard *it*, they fell on
7 their face, and were sore afraid. And Jesus came and touched them, and said, Arise,
8 and be not afraid. And when they had lifted up their eyes, they saw no man, save
9 Jesus only. And as they came down from [out of][6] the mountain, Jesus charged
them, saying, Tell the vision to no man, until the Son of man be [is] risen again[7] from
the dead.

[1] Ver. 1.—[After *apart* there ought to be a period, and *he* inserted after *And* in ver. 2.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 2.—[There is no necessity for *did* in translating ἔλαμψε.—P. S.]

[3] Ver. 3.—[The third person singular, ὤφθη, is preferred by Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Alford, and is better attested, especially by Codd. Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, than ὤφθησαν, but it has no effect upon the English translation. Lange translates: *erschienen*, not *erschien*.—P. S.]

[4] Ver. 4.—Codd. B., C., etc., read: ποιήσω, *I will make*. So Lachmann, Tischendorf, [Alford]. The *lect. rec.*, ποιήσωμεν, *let us make*, corresponds with the text in Mark and Luke. [The first person singular, ποιήσω, is also supported by Cod. Sinait., and is more in keeping with the ardent temperament and self-confidence of Peter.—P. S.]

[5] Ver. 5.—B., D., and most of the authorities read νεφέλη φωτεινή (bright cloud), against νεφ. φωτός (cloud of light). The sense is essentially the same.

[6] Ver. 9.—The critical authorities and editions favor ἐκ, *out of*, against ἀπό, *from*. It indicates probably that they proceeded from a mountain-cave.

[7] Ver. 9.—B., D., etc., ἐγερθῇ.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1. Since the fourth century tradition has fixed on Mount *Tabor*, in Galilee, as the locality of this event. *See* the description of it in Schubert and others. This opinion is, however, evidently untenable. Not only was Mount Tabor inhabited to its summit at the time (*see* Robinson), but it seems exceedingly improbable that Jesus would have so suddenly left His retreat in the highlands of Gaulonitis, and transferred the scene of one of His most secret revelations to Galilee, where He was everywhere persecuted. Besides, ver. 22 implies that the change of residence to Galilee took place at a later period, while in Mark ix. 30 it is distinctly stated, that after these events Jesus had secretly passed through Galilee.

The highest mountain-top in Gaulonitis was Mount *Hermon*. Accordingly, some fix upon Hermon itself as the scene of this event; others on Mount *Panius*, near Cæsarea Philippi. But from the de-

scription of the mountain, and the statement in ver. 9, that "they came down" from its height, it seems likely to have been Hermon.

After six days.—So Matthew and Mark. Luke has it ὡσεὶ ἡμέραι ὀκτώ. According to the common phraseology, the expression, *about eight days*, denoted a week—or, *after six days*, adding the day of Peter's confession. During a whole week the disciples had been bearing about, and meditating upon, the revelation which Christ had made concerning His cross. At the close of it, the Lord prepared for them the first Sabbath of the New Testament,—an earnest and foretaste both of His resurrection and of the Christian Sabbath.

[Alford and others suppose that the transfiguration probably took place in the *night*, for the following reasons: 1) Jesus had gone up to the mountain to pray, Luke ix. 28, which He usually did at night (Luke vi. 12; xxi. 37; xxii. 39; Matt. xiv. 23, 24). 2) The Apostles were asleep, and are described as *having kept awake through this occurrence*, διαγρηγορήσαντες, Luke ix. 32. 3) They did not descend till the next day, Luke ix. 37. 4) The transfiguration itself could be seen to better advantage at night than in daylight.—P. S.]

Ver. 2. **And He was transfigured.**—Matthew and Mark use the term μετεμορφώθη; Luke expresses it, ἐγένετο τὸ εἶδος τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ ἕτερον, κ.τ.λ. According to Luke, this transformation of His appearance took place while He was praying. According to Matthew, **His face shone as the sun, and His garments became white** (bright) **as the light.** Luke has it: "*the fashion of His countenance was altered, and His raiment was white and glistering* [λευκὸς ἐξαστράπτων, *white-glistening*, *weissleuchtend*]." Mark dwells upon the brightness of the raiment: "*it became shining, exceeding white as snow, so* [*such*] *as no fuller on earth can white* [*whiten*] *them.*" Meyer observes, that "this event is not to be regarded as a parallel to what is recorded in Exod. xxxiv. 29, since the shining of Moses' face was the consequence of the preceding appearance of God." As if the text did not refer to a different presence of God from that recorded in Exod. xxxiv! "We know how the human countenance is often lit up by joy, beautified by affection, or wonderfully transformed by the peace and blessedness realized in the hour of death. The revelations vouchsafed to the prophets often made them pale as death (Dan. x.), at other times resplendent with joy. The face of Moses shone when he came down from Mount Sinai, so that no one could bear to look upon his countenance. In the text, we have the highest instance of this kind which could possibly occur in human experience. The infinite fulness of the Spirit was poured out over His whole being; the heavenly glory of His nature, which was still concealed under His earthly appearance (and during His conflict with the kingdom of darkness), now broke forth." (*Leben Jesu*, ii. 2, 905.)* Meyer rightly remarks, that this manifestation of His δόξα was an anticipation of His future state of glory (John xii. 16, 23; xvii. 5, 22–24; 2 Cor. iii. 18; Matt. xiii. 43).

Ver. 3. **And behold!**—Indicating that this was even more marvellous than His own transformation.

There appeared unto them.—The reading ὤφθη, B., D., does not alter the sense. The vision of Moses and Elijah was outward and actual, though implying, at the same time, a peculiar subjective state on the part of the disciples, which was caused by their communion with Jesus. Luke [a physician by profession] furnishes what might be called a psychological account of the matter, when he describes them as heavy with sleep and yet awake throughout. The proximity of these glorified spirits produced, not indeed a morbid state of somnambulism, but a peculiar *moral* state, like that of the ancient seers. It is an idle inquiry, how they came to know the persons who appeared on this occasion; we presume that they immediately recognized the vision in the same manner as they beheld it.

Moses and Elijah.—The appearing of these blessed spirits explains the change which passed on the Lord. For the time He exchanged His intercourse with this world for that with the world above. The fact that a person looks very differently in the midst of festive joy, and when engaged in the ordinary labor of his calling—on a journey, or surveying the scene from a mountain height, and surrounded by his daily cares—while triumphantly standing forth on behalf of some great principle, and when weighed down by temptation or trials,—affords a very faint analogy of this transformation. Commonly, Jesus was engaged in conflict either with the lust or the sorrow of this world; on this occasion, it was the festive celebration of the Messiah.

Talking with Him.—Meyer remarks that we have no information as to this conversation. But the Evangelist Luke states that "*they spake of His departure which He should fulfil at Jerusalem.*" This also furnishes the key to the meaning and object of this vision. It presents the two chief representatives of the Old Covenant as the forerunners of the Messiah, and as acquainted with and cognizant of His impending course of suffering. Hence this may be regarded as an evidence of the agreement of the Old and New Testaments in reference to the sufferings of the Messiah.

Ver. 4. **Lord, it is good for us to be here.**—Not: It is well that we the disciples are here (Paulus, Baumgarten-Crusius, Meyer), that we may provide dwellings for a longer stay; for, although ἡμᾶς precedes ὧδε, the expression evidently includes the Lord. Hence we adopt the common explanation of the verse (proposed by Chrysostom, etc.): It is good for us to be in *this* place—in opposition to Jerusalem; but not as contrasted with the impending sufferings, as is often assumed. The latter would imply that Peter had again lapsed into the carnal views expressed in ch. xvi. 22, which were incompatible with that kingdom of Messiah which was to be established by suffering. On the contrary, we understand the words of Peter as implying that he was even willing to give up the prospect of that coming glory, satisfied if, separated from the world, he could continue, with the Lord and His companions, in spiritual communion with Moses and Elijah. At a still later period we find him ready for suffering, though in the sense of a conflict of suffering by the sword. Hence we may trace the following course of development in his spiritual history: 1. Anticipation of the glory of Messiah in connection with the ancient national polity; 2. in opposition to that polity, but as victorious over it; 3. relinquishment of the hope of the Messianic kingdom in this world, both in its sufferings and its glories; 4. willingness to suffer—but with the sword in hand; 5. after his denial of the Saviour, sim

* [This bursting forth of the inherent glory of Christ is hardly sufficient to account for the brilliancy of His *garments*. I see no objection to call to aid an external heavenly illumination, which undoubtedly surrounded Moses and Elijah as they descended from heaven.—P. S.]

ple willingness to suffer—in hope; 6. anticipation of the glory of the kingdom through suffering and conflict by the sword of the Spirit. These various stages of his experience may be regarded as respectively typifying the Jewish Church—the Gentile Church under Constantine the Great—the monastic Church —the Popish Church, with its two swords — and (5 and 6) the true Church, with its sword of the Spirit.

Three tabernacles.—Arbors, forest tents, hermitages.

Ver. 5. **Behold—and behold.**—A threefold progression, commencing in ver. 3. The first miracle was Christ transfigured and surrounded by the beatified spirits of the representatives of the Old Covenant. The second miracle was the bright cloud, which constituted the sign from heaven, refused to the Jewish authorities who had asked for it, and now granted, unsolicited, to the disciples. The third miracle was the revelation of the Father by a voice from heaven.

A luminous cloud.—The expression *νεφέλη φωτεινή* denotes a light-like, luminous cloud, and not merely "a bright cloud or mist lit up by the sun" (Paulus), (*φωτεινὸς ἥλιος*). It was of the same kind as the cloud at the ascension, or the clouds of heaven at the advent of the Son of man (Matt. xxiv. 30: *καὶ τότε φανήσεται τὸ σημεῖον τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ.* Mark xiii. 26: *καὶ τότε ὄψονται τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐν νεφέλαις μετὰ δυνάμεως πολλῆς καὶ δόξης.* Luke xxi. 27: *ἐν νεφέλῃ μετὰ δυνάμεως καὶ δόξης πολλῆς.* Comp. Dan. vii. 13). Hence, this was the sign from heaven, the real *Shechinah* (שְׁכִינָה, Talmud. *præsentia Dei*; from שָׁכַן, *to lie down, to rest, to dwell*), of which that in Exod. xiii. 21; xl. 34, formed the type, and which in turn was a *symbol* of the spiritual glory resting on the New Testament Church, separating between the holy and the unholy (Isa. iv. 5), and at the same time also a *type* of the splendor of the New Jerusalem, Rev. xxi. 23.

Overshadowed them; *αὐτούς.*—According to *Le Clerc*, all present; according to *Wolf*, *Bengel*, etc., the disciples; according to *de Wette* and *Meyer*, Jesus, Moses, and Elijah. De Wette appeals in confirmation of his view to the account given by Luke. But to us his narrative conveys the impression that all present were overshadowed by a dazzling light, which, as it were, separated them from the earth generally; while Jesus, Moses, and Elijah entered into the cloud which hovered over them, floating along with it. There seems to have been a mutual attraction—of the cloud downward, and of the glorified figures upward. A prelude this of the ascension. Olshausen explains the expression "*overshadowed*," as implying that the light was so overpowering and dazzling as to prevent their looking into the cloud. "The strongest light is = *σκότος*. Hence the latter is used in Scripture instead of the former. The Lord is said to dwell in *φῶς ἀπρόσιτον*, and again *in darkness*, 1 Kings viii. 12; Ex. xx. 21." Meyer misses the point in remarking that such a cloud would overshadow or place the figures in semi-darkness, etc. The effect of the cloud was to overshadow the disciples, or for the time to separate them, on the one hand, from the immediate bodily vision of Jesus, Moses, and Elijah, and of God coming to them; and, on the other, from the profane world. The shadows of a heavenly night were closing around them. Thus Mary had been overshadowed by the *δύναμις ὑψίστου.* Under the Shechinah which overshadowed the Virgin, and separated her from the whole ancient world, bringing her into the most immediate divine presence, Christ was conceived, through the inspiration of heavenly faith.

A voice.—Comp. Luke ii. 14; Matt. iii. 17; Mark i. 11; Luke iii. 22; John xii. 28. Similarly in 2 Pet. i. 17; John i. 33. The solemn attestation of the Messiah and Son of God, vouchsafed to the Jewish theocracy by the voice from heaven, heard by John the Baptist, and through him by the whole nation, had been rejected by the unbelief of the representatives of the synagogue and of the schools. Hence another direct testimony was now granted, this time to the Apostles as the representatives of the *ἐκκλησία*.—**Hear ye Him,**—*αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε*, in an emphatic sense. The divine attestation of Jesus which they had just witnessed, implied the duty of perfect obedience, and of complete self-surrender. At the same time, this command would also convey to the disciples that ideas such as those which Peter entertained, about the kingdom of the Messiah and about the Church, must be laid aside.

Ver. 7. **And Jesus came and touched them.** —Comp. Isa. vi. 5–7; Dan. x. 9, 10; Rev. i. 17.

Ver. 8. **Save Jesus only.**—The moment had now arrived when the Lord required no further testimony from Moses or Elijah in the presence of His disciples. Hitherto the Old Testament had been their warrant and evidence for the New. But now the New Covenant was not only self-evidenced, but serving as confirmation of the Old. The expression also indicates that the hour of festive joy, in anticipation of the coming glory, was now past. From their fellowship with the spirits of the blessed, they were now to descend into the world and into fresh conflicts.

Ver. 9. **The vision.**—*Ὅραμα*; the outward and objective manifestation which they had seen in a state of prophetic inspiration. Different views are entertained about the reason of this prohibition. Meyer suggests that the Lord wished to prevent erroneous expectations of Elijah. We are inclined to take a more general view of the matter. For the object aimed at, it sufficed that the principal nucleus of the Church, or the confidential disciples of Jesus, should be strengthened by this glance of spiritual realities, while the secrecy with which it was invested would tend to preserve the deep and powerful impression. Besides, the vision could not have been related to the other disciples without including Judas among them. In all likelihood it would have incited envy, carnal hopes, or doubts in their minds. The people were, of course, not prepared to receive such a communication. Those among them who were favorably disposed would again have given way to outbursts of enthusiasm; while the adversaries would have either directed their hatred and persecutions to the three disciples who had witnessed the glory of Christ, or else sought to controvert and to shake their blessed conviction of the spiritual realities which had opened before them. Not till after the resurrection of Christ from Sheol was the world to be taught how much better and happier than, in their dread of death, they had hitherto imagined, was the state of the pious in Sheol (for example, Moses and Elijah). The fact that Christ—the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever —had all along lit up the gloom of Sheol, was only to appear when, at and by His resurrection, Sheol itself ceased to exist.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *See* the *Exegetical and Critical Notes.*

2. *The history of the Transfiguration.*—Various views are entertained on this subject: 1. It has been regarded as merely a vision. Thus Tertullian (*Contra Marc.* iv. 22), Herder, and Gratz. 2. Meyer regards it as partly a vision, and partly an objective reality. The appearance of Moses and Elijah was, in his opinion, merely a vision; while the glorious change in the outward appearance of Jesus was an objective reality. 3. All the ancient dogmatic writers characterize it as a purely outward and visible event. To this Meyer objects, that it would imply that the resurrection of Moses was past; as if the spirits of the blessed were necessarily destitute of all corporeity or form. To the same effect Grotius remarks: *Hæc corpora videri possunt a Deo in hunc usum asservata;* while Thomas Aquinas suggests that Moses made use of a body not his own.* 4. A number of natural explanations of the event have been hazarded. Thus it has been represented—(*a*) as a vision in a dream (Gabler, Rau, Kuinoel, even Neander); (*b*) accompanied by a thunder-storm (Gabler); (*c*) as a meeting between Jesus and two secret, unknown adherents (Kuinoel, Venturini, Paulus, Hase); (*d*) as an atmospheric phenomenon (Paulus, Ammon). 5. Ewald regards it as a real occurrence, but with mythical embellishments. 6. Schulz, Strauss, and others represent it as a pure myth, on the ground of the injunction to keep it a secret, which they regard as a fiction.† 7. It has been viewed as an allegory, or a figurative representation of the spiritual light imparted on that occasion to the disciples respecting the character and work of Jesus (Weisse). 8. In our opinion, it belongs to a higher sphere of existence, combining the two elements of outward manifestation and spiritual vision (*see Leben Jesu,* ii. 2, p. 904; and on the general question, ii. 1, p. 41). Even Meyer, who represents one part of the narrative as an objective reality, and the other as merely a vision, admits that although the voice from heaven was a spiritual and inward transaction, yet it seemed an outward perception to those who were in a state of vision.

3. The transfiguration of the Lord was a manifestation of the spiritual world in the midst of earthly life. It was as if the Lord had already entered His mansions of glory. Viewing it as a stage in the history of His personal development, the transfiguration may be characterized as occupying a place intermediate between the walking on the sea, and the hearing the voice from heaven in the precincts of the temple, John xii. "In certain diseases, a luminous appearance of the body has been observed by physicians as a strange and rare symptom. This may serve at least to show the physical possibility of such an emission of light from the body, although it has never been noticed as marking the highest state of health and vigor." Both the founder and the restorer of the kingdom of God under the Old dispensation, who had equally been removed from this world in a miraculous manner (Deut. xxxiv. 6; 2 Kings ii. 11), and Jesus Himself (whose resurrection was at hand), were transfigured into the same glorified state. O. von Gerlach: "At His baptism Jesus had as the Son of Man entered that new kingdom of God upon earth which He Himself had founded. But at the transfiguration He had reached the period of His history, when, having fully shown His *active* obedience, He was to display chiefly His *passive* obedience. This may be described as a season of rest in His half-accomplished victory."

4. The meeting of the Lord with Moses and Elijah conveys a threefold lesson. (*a*) *It shows the bearing of the future upon the present world.* The dead are waiting the appearance of the Lord. He lit up the gloom of hades, brought life to its inmates, and threw open its gates. The most exalted of the departed spirits here do homage to Him. (*b*) *It discloses the bearing of the visible upon the invisible world.* The event here recorded may be regarded as the earnest and commencement of Christ's preaching to the spirits in prison. It was succeeded by the movement which took place among the dead when Christ arose (Matt. xxvii. 42), and fully realized when He descended into hades to preach the gospel there (Matt. xii. 40; Eph. iv. 9; 1 Pet. iii. 19; iv. 6).* (*c*) *We gather how this world and the next meet, so to speak, and coalesce in the resurrection of Jesus.* The difference of time and circumstances here gives place to a higher unity. The disciples were now taught that the sufferings and death of the Messiah did not sever the connection between Him and the Old Testament,—more especially, that between Jesus and the lawgiver who condemned blasphemers to death, and even the zealous prophet who had called down fire from heaven; while these very sufferings constituted the superiority of the Saviour over the representatives of the Old dispensation. "Again, as at Jordan, did the representatives of the two covenants meet." Besides, the gulf of space was also bridged over by this event. In the person of Christ the barriers which separate between this and the other world began to give way. They gave place to a higher unity. This transition was completed at His resurrection. Hence also this meeting may be characterized as an anticipation of the final "reconciling" of things in heaven and in earth (Col. i. 20).

5. *The cloud.*—("Not a dark cloud, like that which rested on Sinai." O. von Gerlach.)—It served not merely as a figure of the presence of God, but, like the pillar of cloud and of fire which intervened between Israel and the Egyptians, it had a twofold aspect—bringing light to the one party, and concealing it from the other. "As the brightness which overshadowed them may be regarded as a manifestation of heavenly in the midst of earthly life, so the luminous cloud as the outward garb which heavenly life prepares for itself from earthly objects, since it cannot appear in all its inherent glory. Similarly is the light of heaven tempered for our earth by the intervention of clouds," which reflect that light for us as need requireth. To us it appears exceedingly significant, that the cloud which separated the disciples

* [Delitzsch, *Bibl. Psychologie,* p. 369, supposes that Moses assumed an immaterial yet external visible (?) appearance conformable to his former body.—P. S.]

† [Strauss views the transfiguration as a poetic imitation of the event related, Ex. xxiv. 1: xxxiv. 29 sq., when Moses went up to Mount Sinai into the presence of Jehovah, and on returning "his face shone," that the children of Israel were afraid to come nigh him. Strauss thinks the only alternative lies between his mytho-poetic and the old orthodox view. *See* his new *Leben Jesu,* 1864, p. 516 sqq. But the circumstantial agreement of the three Evangelists in their account, the definite chronological date of the event, its connection with what follows, the allusion to it by one of the witnesses in 2 Pet. i. 16-18, and the many peculiar traits to which no parallel is found in the transfiguration of Moses, make the mythical view impossible here. Renan, in his *Vie de Jésus,* ignores the transfiguration.—P. S.]

* [Compare here my note on p. 228 sqq.—P. S.]

from the Lord appeared at the very moment when Peter uttered a saying which, as we have seen, was indicative of his peculiar state of mind. Hence the command, "Hear ye Him," may be regarded as in a special manner addressed to him.

6. From Luke ix. 33 we gather that Peter addressed this proposal to the Lord when he saw Moses and Elijah about to part from Him. It was then that the cloud overshadowed them, and the voice from heaven was heard. It seems as if Peter would have outwardly detained those blessed spirits to protract the glory of that hour. "He wished to institute a sort of high-church establishment,* or to found a monastic order. The communion which he was about to inaugurate was to have Christ for its leader, Moses for its lawgiver, and Elijah for its zealot,—in short, there was to be an outward amalgamation of the Old and New Testaments. Hence the attempt to detain those who now enjoyed a spiritual existence, and to perpetuate their terrestrial appearance in this world. Thus spake Simon, not Peter—a type of that Church which still appeals to his authority. The Evangelists add, by way of apology, 'He wist not what he said'" (*Leben Jesu*, ii. 2, p. 907). He was now ready in one sense to renounce the world; but his surrender was merely outward. The proposal forcibly recalls to our minds a later scene and utterance: "Lord, not my feet only, but also my hands and my head."

7. The prostration of the disciples at the vision, reminds us of the similar experience of the prophets. At another time, John experienced the same awe (Rev. i.), showing the infinite majesty of Christ's appearance. Such also shall be the effect of the sign from heaven on the nations of the earth in the day of judgment (Matt. xxiv. 30).

8. *The object of this vision.*—Before the disciples could with safety descend into the depths of temptation connected with the cross of Christ, they were, so to speak, fastened to heaven by the cords of this vision. "The Church was to have fellowship with spiritual realities, and with the world of spirits, before those weak hearts could be converted into bold and triumphant witnesses to meet the world, death, and hell" (*Leben Jesu*, ii. 2, 909).

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The anticipation of Christ's final glory.—The miraculous transfiguration *of* the Lord a pledge of our miraculous transfiguration *by* the Lord.—*And after six days;* or, the first week of suffering on the part of the disciples, previous to the sufferings of the Lord Himself: 1. Its beginning: the confession of Peter, and the announcement of the Lord's sufferings. 2. Its employment: familiarizing their minds with thoughts of the cross. 3. Its close: a glorious Sabbath on the holy mount.—The three intimate disciples of the Lord an image of His close followers in the Church: 1. John, as representing the friends of Jesus who rest on His breast; 2. Peter, or the servants of Christ who prepare the extension of His kingdom; 3. James, or the courageous and persevering witnesses of His cross: Or, contemplation, preaching, and martyrdom.—We must be willing to follow the Lord to the summit of a high mountain, if we wish to see His own glorious light shed over the deep valley of His humiliation and sufferings.—The holy mountains.—Prayer the path to glory (see the Psalms which ascend from supplication to praise). —Prayer the direction of the heart toward heaven.—How by prayer the heart of the pilgrim may outstrip his footsteps to the heights of transfiguration.—The transfiguration of Jesus on the mount at once the deepest mystery and the most glorious revelation.—The transfiguration of the Lord an earnest of the transfiguration of His sufferings.—The brightness of spiritual joy, as reflected by the flame of the sacrifice of a heart which surrenders all unto God.—The shining raiment of Christ the garb of believers.—The natural body destined to become a spiritual body, 1 Cor. xv.—The Church of Christ at its first festive season appearing as a spiritual communion: 1. A communion of the saints of the Old and New Covenant; 2. of the Church below and the Church above; 3. of the Lord and His disciples; 4. of the Father, and of all the blessed spirits who serve the Son.—The suffering Saviour in His relationship to Moses and Elijah.—The office of the law, and that of the gospel, 2 Cor. iii. 7.—The three glorified figures, and the three non-glorified figures—between them the Father—a picture of the Church universal, militant and triumphant.—Moses a witness of immortality under the New Testament.—The history of Peter's spiritual development a type of that of the Church.—The good intention, and the error of Peter: 1. He was anxious to display the agreement between the Old and New Covenants; but by an outward amalgamation, not by their internal connection. 2. He was ready to renounce the world; but by an outward institution (such as monasticism and anchoretism), not by an inward act. 3. He wished to perpetuate this season of spiritual fellowship; but by giving it an outward and fixed form, not by converting it into a spring of hidden life.—That form of antichristian error which appeals to the authority of Peter has given rise to the erection of three tabernacles (Moses: the Greek Church; Elijah: the Roman Church; Christ: the Evangelical Church).—While Peter was speaking, a cloud intervened, which for a while separated the disciples from their Lord.—The bright overshadowing cloud, a figure of the gospel as the great revealed mystery, 1 Tim. iii. 16.—How the heavenly voice ever continues to resound through the Church: "*This is My beloved Son!*" (*See* 2 Pet. i. 17.)—How the disciples received a fresh prophetic consecration when they were overawed by the majesty of God.—The awe of the elect under the manifestations of the Lord. —How Christ restored His disciples from the awe produced by this revelation, in order that they might experience its blessedness!—When they raised their eyes, they saw no one but *Jesus alone*—true of religious experience generally: 1. It applied to the disciples in reference to Moses and Elijah; 2. to the Reformers and their knowledge; 3. to believers and the ground of their salvation.—During our whole earthly pilgrimage we must always again come down from the Mount of Refreshment.—In order to rise the higher, we must ever be ready to descend lower and lower.—We should jealously watch over our Christian experiences, and not lightly divulge them.—All our spiritual comforts are granted to strengthen us for the conflicts which we have to encounter, until the last decisive conflict.—The transformation on

* [In German: *Hochkirche*, a term often improperly used by German writers as a noun, and as identical with the established church of England, when *high church*, *low church*, and *broad church* are adjectives only to designate the different parties or theological schools in the Anglican Church, or in the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States. It is surprising that the Edinb. translation literally renders *High Church*, which, to the best of my knowledge, is never used as a noun in good English.—P. S.]

the mount, a symbol of Christ's eternal glory, John xvii.

Starke:—*Nova Bibl. Tub.*: How blessed to enjoy close fellowship with Jesus! for then shall we be allowed to see His glory.—The Lord bestows a peculiar measure of heavenly comfort on those whom He calls to greater than ordinary trials.—Special revelations and communications are special gifts which all are not able to bear.—Christ's glory on the mount a foretoken of His greater glory in heaven, Rev. i. 12.—How great will be the brightness of the saints in glory, when they shall be transformed into the image of the glorified body of Christ! 1 Cor. xv. 41.—*Majus*: All the glory of this world is not worthy to be compared with the transcendent glory of eternity.—*Canstein*: Satan and his kingdom is darkness; Christ and His glory (His kingdom) pure light.—*Hedinger*: The blessed communion of the saints in glory.—The communion of the Church militant and triumphant.—*Zeisius*: Thus the doctrine of immortality is established and sure.—The saints of former ages will return in greater glory.—*Osiander*: Those who have tasted (even in small measure) of the powers of the world to come, will forget all that is transitory, even though it have been glorious. *Zeisius*: If Peter so soon recognized Moses and Elias, whom he had never seen, what must be the mutual *recognition* of the elect, and what their communion in heaven!—See to it, that you be found in Christ, and God will also be well pleased in you, Eph. i. 6.—*Canstein*: Sinful men cannot approach unto God without a Mediator.—*Cramer*: Christ's hand is strong to heal; whatever He touches becomes vigorous, strong, and sound.—*Osiander*: God reveals Himself unto us, not to destroy, but to save.—Such also will be Christ's voice at the last day, "Arise, and be not afraid!" John v. 25.—In Christ the law and the prophets are fulfilled: hence Moses and Elias must vanish, and Christ alone remain; for there is salvation in none other, Acts iv. 12.—*Zeisius*: Truths have their destined time of revelation from God, Dan. xii. 4, 8, 9.—High revelations should not exalt any one, 2 Cor. xii. 7.—*Cramer*: In the discharge of our ministerial duties we should do nothing without a special call, or for the purpose of advancing our own reputation and glory.

Braune: The lawgiver (Moses) and the preacher of repentance (Elijah) give way at last before the glory of the Son of God.—Jesus alone.

Gerlach:*—When entering upon His sufferings, the Lord Jesus was confirmed in His dignity.—In this vision the disciples were to recognize—1. The unity and connection of the Old and New Covenants; 2. that of the kingdom of grace and of glory; 3. of our perishable earthly, and of the glorified body.—With what calmness Christ entered into a state by which His disciples, in their weakness and carnality, were overpowered.—The similarity of the glory of Christ and that of Moses, and their difference (2 Cor. iii.; Exod. xxxiv. 29). 1. Moses only reflected a higher light; Christ was received into it. 2. The glory of Moses was dazzling and terrifying; that of Christ, though overpowering, was full of comfort. 3. The glory of Moses gradually vanished; while the transfiguration of Christ remained till the cloud concealed Him from view.

Lisco:—This foretaste of blessedness must have lightened the cross, strengthened the disciples for the coming conflict, and awakened within them a longing after full perfection.

Heubner:—The transfiguration of the Lord in its practical import: 1. So far as the Lord Himself was concerned, it served to strengthen Him on the path of sorrow and suffering on which He was about to enter. 2. So far as the disciples were concerned, it served as an evidence that Jesus was the Son of God; it implied a promise of support under severe trials, and a pledge of the resurrection of the body.

Sermons on the transfiguration, by *Ephraim Syrus*, *Theremin*.—*J. Müller* (in Fliedner's *Ein Herr, ein Glaube*): the three stages in the Christian life: the transfiguration of Jesus, the emotion of the disciples, the thronging of the people.—*Uhle*: How we should act when hearing reports of extraordinary operations of grace: 1. We are not at once to reject the account; 2. nor to attempt exciting or forcing a revival; 3. but in the humble and faithful discharge of our work, to await a gracious manifestation from on high.—*Rambach*: Heaven on earth: 1. Where it may be found: (*a*) In secret fellowship with God; (*b*) in a life of spiritual love and friendship; (*c*) in the courts and at the altar of the Lord. 2. How it should be sought: (*a*) By preserving purity of heart (or by perseverance in the faith); (*b*) by constant increase of spirituality in our wishes and inclinations (or sanctification); (*c*) by ever keeping before our minds and hearts our eternal calling (or watching and prayer).—*Carstädt* in ZURN'S *Predigt-Buch*, 1848: How Christ is still transfigured in those who follow Him up to the mountain.—*Hagenbach*: Seasons of transfiguration in the life of Christians.—*Gruner*: The spirits of our friends in glory hovering around us so long as we continue worthy of them. [Compare a most eloquent sermon of Dr. *Fr. W. Krummacher* on the Transfiguration, at the close of his *Elijah the Tishbite*.—P. S.]

* Gerlach and Lisco adhere to the tradition that Tabor was the mount of transfiguration. But it would betray weakness and want of freedom to insist upon this point in a sermon simply on account of the catholic tradition.

D. *The Church as wholly unknown and hidden.* CH. XVII. 10–13.

(Mark ix. 11–13.)

10 And his disciples asked him, saying, Why then say the scribes that Elias [Elijah]
11 must first come? And Jesus [he][1] answered and said unto them,[2] Elias [Elijah] truly
12 shall first[3] come [cometh], and [shall] restore all things.[4] But I say unto you, That
Elias [Elijah] is come already,[5] and they knew him not, but have done unto him [with
him, ἐν αὐτῷ] whatsoever they listed [would, ἠθέλησαν]: likewise shall also the Son of

13 man suffer of [by, ὑπ'] them. Then the disciples understood that he spake unto them of John the Baptist.

[1] Ver. 10.—Ἰησοῦς is omitted in Codd. B., D., L., Z., etc. [also in Cod. Sinait., and in all the modern crit. editions. *See* Tregelles and Alford.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 11.—Αὐτοῖς, *unto them*, is omitted in B., C., D., etc., and by Lachmann and Tischendorf. [The literal translation, therefore, according to the oldest reading, would be: *And He answering said.*—P. S.]

[3] Ver. 11.—Πρῶτον, *first*, is wanting in B., D., and many other witnesses [also in Cod. Sinait.], and looks like a repetitious insertion from ver. 10 and Mark ix. 12. [So also Meyer and Alford.]

[4] Ver. 11.—[Ἠλίας μὲν ἔρχεται καὶ ἀποκαταστήσει πάντα; Lange: *Elias kommt freilich und wird Alles wiederherstellen;* Ewald: *Elia zwar kommt und wird Alles wiederherstellen;* Conant: *Elijah indeed comes and shall restore all things.* The present tense in the first verb is simply an assertion of the *certainty* of the coming of Elijah without reference to the past or future, and involves, therefore, no contradiction with ἤδη ἦλθεν in ver. 12. The verb ἔρχεσθαι, however, like the English *to come*, and the German *kommen*, includes in the nature of the case the significance of the future tense, comp. John iv. 23: ἔρχεται ὥρα καὶ νῦν ἐστιν; iv. 21; xiv. 8; xvi. 2, and the part. præs. ὁ ἐρχόμενος, of the Messiah, Matt. iii. 11, and the apocalyptic formula: ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος. There is, therefore, no necessity whatever to resort in such cases, after the old fashion, to a supposed Hebraism, an arbitrary *enallage temporum*, which falls with the assumption that the Hebrew language uses *promiscue* the past for the future and *vice versâ*, an error which has been amply refuted by Ewald, *Krit. Grammat.*, p. 523 sqq. Comp. also Winer's *Grammat.*, § 40, p. 237; and Alex. Buttmann's *Grammat. des N. T.* (Berlin, 1859), p. 176.—P. S.]

[5] Ver. 12.—[Better: *already come*, ἤδη ἦλθεν.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 10. **Why then?**—Although the particle οὖν seems at first sight to connect this query with the preceding prohibition of Christ (Meyer), it rather refers to the fact that Elijah had departed, and was not accompanying them (Grotius, Michaelis, Fritzsche, Olshausen, and the author in his "*Leben Jesu*").* Euth. Zigaben., and others, erroneously interpret the clause: Why did Elijah not come *before Thee* (not till now)?—Equally untenable is the view of Chrysostom, Theophylact, and Neander, who understand it as implying the inquiry, whether the appearance of Elijah which had just taken place was that to which the scribes referred, or whether another was still to be expected. Still more erroneous is the glossary of Schleiermacher and others, that the disciples remarked that Elijah had not yet appeared. Lightfoot observes (on the passage): It was expected that Elijah should come and settle the controversies pending between the various Jewish schools, bring back the pot of manna and Aaron's rod, and sanctify the people by a lustration.

Ver. 11. **Elijah truly shall first come**, or lit. and according to the true reading: **Elijah indeed cometh.**—Jesus confirmed this doctrine, which was based on Mal. iii. 13; iv. 5. He adds: καὶ ἀποκαταστήσει πάντα, "which is derived (says de Wette correctly) and somewhat enlarged from Mal. iv. 6, '*he shall turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers*' (compare Luke i. 17); and iii. 1, '*and he shall prepare the way before Me*' (Luke iii. 4). Properly speaking, the ἀποκατάστασις πάντων (according to the Sept. Mal. iv. 6), comp. Acts iii. 21, is specially the work of the Messiah, and Elijah could only be said to prepare the way for it." Of course the expression must be understood as merely implying such a preparation. Meyer: A *restitutio in integrum* of the position and circumstances of the theocracy, which was to be effected by the Messiah, and prepared and introduced by Elijah.—In the confirmatory reply of Christ, the *present* ἔρχεται is used in the sense of the future, while the future tense in the next clause indicates that the Lord enters into this dogma. Hence it is not incompatible with what follows: "Elijah is already come."

Ver. 12. **But I say unto you.**—A more distinct explanation of the disclosure which He had already made on an earlier occasion, Matt. xi. 14. Hence we conclude that the prophecy of Malachi concerning the advent of Elijah was fulfilled, in the proper sense, in the appearance of John the Baptist, who had accomplished the preparatory ἀποκατάστασις, by his preaching of repentance, by his testimony to Jesus and by pointing his disciples to Him, as well as by his martyrdom.

They knew him not.—In his peculiar character as the forerunner of the Messiah (or in respect of the fulfilment of the prophecy concerning Elijah). The persons here alluded to were his contemporaries generally, more especially the scribes (ver. 10). Comp. Matt. xi.

Done unto him, or better: **with him.***—Ποιεῖν ἔν τινι, not classical, taken from the Septuagint, Gen. xl. 14; Dan xi. 7; [Luke xxiii. 39].—**Whatever they would**, ὅσα ἠθέλησαν.—In wilful apostasy from their living connection with the prophets, and in opposition to the obedience due to him. A prelude this to the similar and decisive rejection of the Messiah Himself.

* [Alford refers οὖν to both, the withdrawal of Elijah from the eyes of the disciples, and the injunction of the Lord not to tell the vision. "How should this be? If this was not the coming of Elijah, *was he yet to come?* If it was, how was it so *secret* and so *short?*"—P. S.]

* [Lange: *an ihm gethan.*]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. On the fulfilment of the prophecy of Malachi, *see* the preceding notes and Matt. xi. Otto von Gerlach remarks: "It refers to the ministry of one or more messengers of God, in the spirit and power of Elijah. In this sense, Elijah had reappeared in John; and in the same sense will another Elijah precede the second coming of the Lord." But we must maintain: 1. That the prophecy of Malachi was distinctly fulfilled in John the Baptist. 2. That in the same sense no other Elijah can come, as the Old Covenant, which both represented, is abrogated by the gospel.—Still, in every age, the Lord has His forerunners of the order of Elijah, and especially before His final appearance.

2. On descending from the mountain, the fact of Christ's future sufferings is immediately brought forward again. Gladly would the disciples have taken

the glorified spirits down with them into the conflict with the unbelief of the world. The question seems to have haunted their minds, Could not Elijah prevent the impending conflict and sufferings? To this mental objection, Christ replied, according to Mark, "How it is written of the Son of Man, that He must suffer many things, and be set at nought." In other words, they were to read the prediction concerning Elijah in the light of those concerning the Son of Man. Then follows the declaration: Elijah is indeed come; but, so far from preventing the sufferings of the Messiah, he himself has fallen in the service and ministry of God. From this the disciples might infer what His future would be. And now, more than ever before, were they to feel that they were about to witness the most solemn and awful conflict, and that a deep abyss of suffering, into which they were immediately to descend, intervened between the old and the new order of things.

3. All mere traditionalism and ritualism are here denounced as arbitrary will-worship, and a demoniacal service of the flesh and of self. The blessed spirits who represented genuine and divine tradition—the prophets, restorers and reformers of the kingdom of God—received the same treatment at the hands of these guardians of outward and legal traditionalism, as civilized men do who land on inhospitable shores, inhabited by savages and cannibals. In short, they failed to understand and see what their own symbols implied, nor did they acknowledge their living embodiments, because their will was perverted, and, while feigning the strictest adherence to the letter of the law, they in reality served the will of the flesh.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The fresh perplexities of the disciples on descending from the Mount of Transfiguration.—After the barrier which separates this life from the other has fallen, the deep abyss of the cross opens, intervening between the old and the new order of things.—How the scribes by their false literality perverted even the word of God into traditions, and transformed it into dangerous error.—The Scripture has been fulfilled in a much wider sense than that elicited by the dead learning of the letter only.—How traditionalism fails to recognize Elijah, even while studying his description as given in the word.—Self-seeking under the garb of traditionalism.—The true Church of the Lord hidden and unknown amidst the old and formal community of Israel.—The great messengers of God, known only by report in the world: 1. They were announced, but not properly expected. 2. They came, but were despised and ill-treated. 3. While actually in the world, their future coming was still expected with fanatical anticipations.—Even in this world, a distance wide as the poles intervenes between the children of God and the servants of the devil.—Traditionalism persecuting and murdering the living prophets, and at the same time adorning the graves of the old prophets whom their fathers had murdered (Matt. xxiii. 29).—The glorious day of God is hid in this mortal life from the children of darkness.—Elijah had just been among them; yet they still continued to expect and to teach that Elijah would come. All God's dealings and works are spiritual, and pass by unknown and unnoticed on account of the carnal services which men mistake for the reality.—The spirit of true religion, and a dead ministry and services.—John the Baptist the Elijah of his age: 1. The affinity of their character; 2. of their mission; 3. of their success (Elijah prepared the way for the Messianic prophecies—John, for Christ Himself).—The age of Elijah and that of John: 1. The external difference between them (in the one case, unbelief and apostasy from the law; in the other, traditionalism). 2. Their internal agreement (in the one case, worldliness, apostasy, and hatred of the prophets; in the other, obduracy against the voice and reproofs of the Spirit).—The sufferings of John a foretaste of the sufferings of Christ.—Preserve in your hearts the blessed mystery of the Mount of Transfiguration, and then boldly descend into the terrors of the valley.

Starke:—Majus: We must not take in a literal sense what is intended to be spiritually understood in Holy Writ, as this would necessarily give rise to errors.—*Quesnel:* There never was an age which had not its Elijah, zealous and jealous for the honor of God; but woe to him who stops his ears!—The world knows not the children and the servants of God, 1 John iii. 1.—All witnesses to the truth must suffer sorrow, ignominy, and tribulation, Acts xiv. 22.—Jesus the best expositor of Scripture.

Heubner:—All preachers of repentance are forerunners of Christ.—Great men have commonly the same fate.—From the fate of His forerunner, the Lord Jesus might anticipate what awaited Himself.—Ἀποκαθιστάναι, *i. e.*, to restore the ancient, divine, and original order of things. But the main point is, to determine the right date, and what the genuine original really is.—Thus we are to go back for our authority to the time of the Apostles, and not, like the Roman Catholics, to the state of things immediately before the Reformation.

E. *The Church as working Wonders by the Power of Spiritual Prayer and Fasting.* CH. XVII. 14–21.

(Mark ix. 14–29; Luke ix. 37–43.)

14 And when they[1] were come to the multitude, there came to him a *certain*[2] man,
15 kneeling down to him, and saying, Lord, have mercy on my son; for he is lunatic
[σεληνιάζεται], and sore vexed [sorely afflicted]:[3] for ofttimes he falleth into the fire,
16 and oft into the water. And I brought him to thy disciples, and they could not cure
17 him. Then Jesus answered and said, O faithless and perverse generation, how long
shall I be with you? how long shall I suffer you [bear with you, ἀνέξομαι ὑμῶν]?
18 Bring him hither to me. And Jesus rebuked the devil [him, αὐτῷ], and he [the de-

mon, τὸ δαιμόνιον][4] departed out of him: and the child was cured from that very[5] hour.
19 Then came the disciples to Jesus apart, and said, Why could not we cast him out?
20 And Jesus said unto them, Because of your unbelief [little faith]:[6] for verily I say
unto you, If ye have faith as a grain of mustard-seed [mustard], ye shall say unto this
mountain, Remove hence to yonder place; and it shall remove; and nothing shall be
21 impossible unto [to] you. Howbeit [But, δὲ] this kind goeth not out but [except] by
prayer and fasting.

[1] Ver. 14.—Codd. B., Z. [and Cod. Sinait.] omit αὐτῶν, and so does Lachmann. Tischendorf reads ἐλθών after Cod. D., Vulgate, al. [This must refer to a former edition, for in the *editio septima* of his large Greek Testament, 1859, Tischendorf reads: ἐλθόντων αὐτῶν. So does Alford.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 14.—[*Certain* is an unnecessary interpolation, which dates from Tyndale and was retained in all the later Protestant E. V. But Wiclif and the N. T. of Rheims omit it.—P. S.]

[3] Ver. 15.—Κακῶς πάσχει. Lachmann reads ἔχει after B., L., Z., [also Cod. Sinait.], which is probably an emendation, since πάσχει seemed to be superfluous after κακῶς. So Meyer. [Mark has instead of it ἔχον πνεῦμα ἄλαλον, and hence Lange translates here: *hat ein böses Leiden, has a malignant evil.*—P. S.]

[4] Ver. 18.—[The transposition of *devil* and the *pronoun* in some of the English versions, is an attempt to improve the style of the original, which is no part of the translator's work, least of all in the Bible.—P. S.]

[5] Ver. 18.—[*From that hour*, ἀπὸ τῆς ὥρας ἐκείνης. *Very* is an unwarranted addition, which presents the case more strongly than the sacred writer, in his natural simplicity and modesty, intended.—P. S.]

[6] Ver. 20.—[Lachmann reads with his authorities ὀλιγοπιστίαν, *little faith*. This may be an emendation to soften the expression, as Meyer and Alford assume; but it has the authority of the Vatican, and of the Sinaitic MS. If we retain ἀπιστίαν, with Tischendorf and Alford, it should be rendered *want* (absence) *of faith*, instead of *unbelief*, which is too strong.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

"In all the three synoptists, the cure of the lunatic follows on the transfiguration—a circumstance which may be regarded as one of the evidences of the genuineness and authenticity of the narrative, and against the mythical hypothesis." Meyer.

Ver. 14. **Kneeling down to Him.**—He saluted Him, doing homage with bended knees: γονυπετῶν αὐτόν.

Ver. 15. **Lunatic.**—Meyer seems to suppose that lunacy and epilepsy, and demoniacal possession excluded each other. Our conviction, on the other hand, is, that a certain amount of nervous derangement uniformly accompanied all demoniacal possessions. Comp. our previous remarks [on ch. iv. 24, p. 96, and on ch. viii. 28, etc., pp. 164–166]. The suggestion of Olshausen, that they were partly caused by sensual indulgences, appears to us based on a confusion of two different states—surrender to the power of demons, and to that of sin.

Ver. 17. **Perverse Generation,** γενεὰ διεστραμμένη.—The expression is not merely intended as a general designation, but has a peculiar and distinctive meaning. It implies perversion, in the sense of being seduced or led astray (διαστρέφεσθαι). In their grief at the announcement of the Lord's impending sufferings, the disciples who had been left behind, had, at least partially, given way to the spirit of the world. A slight analogy may here be traced to the return of Moses from the mount, when he found the people assembled around the golden calf. According to the ancient expositors, these words of Jesus were addressed to the person who sought relief; according to Calvin, to the scribes; according to Paulus, Olshausen, and others, to all the people present; according to Bengel, de Wette, and Meyer, to the disciples. No doubt the Lord referred primarily to the disciples, though evidently as in connection with the persons by whom they were surrounded. The rebuke itself may be regarded as a gentle moral exorcism, addressed to them before the Lord proceeded to cure the demoniac. Meyer speaks of the "strong feeling" expressed by Jesus. This should, however, be viewed in its higher bearing as an indignant emotion, by which the Saviour first of all expelled the spirit of dejection from the circle of His disciples.

How long shall I bear with you?—De Wette remarks: "Jesus here blames their want of self-dependence, their continual dependence upon Him, since He would so soon have to part from them (ἔσομαι), and that they so often put His patience and forbearance to the test." In that case, the first ἕως πότε would mean: *not long* shall I be with you; and the second: *too long*, etc. But this view is evidently untenable. Besides, in the parallel passage in Luke, the expression ἕως πότε occurs only once. But, on the other hand, we must not understand it as implying, I have been and borne too long with you. In our opinion, the consciousness of His approaching departure from the disciples seems to have led the Saviour to a twofold application of it to present circumstances: How soon will you require, in dependence on My Spirit, to stand and act alone! and again: How soon shall your present state of weakness, which calls for infinite forbearance on My part, require to give place to spiritual decision!

Bring him hither.—Although this is addressed to the disciples, it must also have applied to the father of the lad. According to the narrative in the Gospel by Mark (which furnishes a number of details), the crowd gave way at the appearance of Christ. The people ran to meet the Lord,—foremost among them, no doubt, the father of the child, and the disciples. The scribes probably followed more slowly, the lad being in their company. While they were bringing him to the Lord, he was seized with a fearful paroxysm whenever he came within sight of Jesus. *See* also the narratives in Mark and Luke.

Ver. 18. **And Jesus rebuked him.**—In accordance with His ordinary method of healing demoniacs. *See* above. The details of the cure are furnished by Mark and Luke.

Ver. 20. **Because of your unbelief** [better: **want of faith,** διὰ τὴν ἀπιστίαν].—The reproof does not refer to unbelief in regard to the divine power of effecting this miracle. In point of fact, they had attempted to cure the child. But Christ here alludes to their dejection on account of His impending suffer-

ings, which arose from unbelief of the heart. They had not yet sufficiently exercised prayer and fasting, which would lead them to full renunciation of the world.

As a grain of mustard.—*See* ch. xiii. 33.—**To remove mountains.**—Comp. Matt. xxi. 21, where the expression is even more strongly worded than here. In both cases, it is a figure implying the removal of the most formidable obstacles, 1 Cor. xiii. 2. For legends about the removal of mountains, *see* Calovius and Starke. Similar miracles were ascribed, amongst others, to Gregory Thaumaturgus and Hilarion.—Among the Jews, an eloquent teacher was described as one who removed mountains. Stier, ii. p. 242.

Ver. 21. **This kind,** τοῦτο τὸ γένος.—Various explanations of this expression: 1. It has been applied to the demons generally, as constituting a "*kind*." Thus Chrysostom, Fritzsche, and others. 2. This particular kind of demons. Grotius, de Wette, Meyer. 3. Sieffert refers it to the ἀπιστία of the disciples. 4. Theile applies it very strangely to the Apostles, in the sense, this kind of men proceed no further than prayer and fasting (!)—The second view (of Grotius, etc.) is so far supported by the circumstance, that the case of this demoniac was peculiarly aggravated. He was dumb and deaf; he threw himself into the fire and into the water, foamed and gnashed, and could only be healed during a fearful paroxysm. After the evil spirit had left him, he fell down as if dead; and the Lord was obliged to restore him by a second miracle, taking hold of him by the hand. Still it were a mistake to regard this demoniacal possession as different from others in kind, and not merely in degree, and hence as constituting a peculiar kind, for which specific prayer and fasting were required. The Lord rather conveyed to His disciples that they had not preserved or cultivated the state of mind and heart necessary for the occasion, that they were not sufficiently prepared and collected to cast out so malignant a demon. The dumbness and deafness indicated a melancholy and obstinacy, from which, in their dejection about the impending sufferings of Christ, the disciples themselves were not at that moment quite free. Besides, we must not forget on all such occasions that Judas was still among them.

Prayer and fasting.—Some commentators erroneously apply this statement to the diseased person. Thus Chrysostom: the prayer and fasting of the sufferer. Paulus: proper diet and abstinence (!) Ammon: invigoration of the soul by devotional exercises, and depression of the body by suitable abstinence. De Wette, Meyer, and others correctly refer it to the conditions necessary for such a faith as to work miracles. Meyer regards vers. 20 and 21 as a gradation. But even in ver. 20 the term *mountain* is intended to convey the idea of a very great difficulty, such as that before them. Hence ver. 21 is intended to furnish directions in what particular manner they were to prepare for meeting this kind of demons. The demons of such deep melancholy could only be overcome by the sacrifice of most earnest prayer, and complete renunciation of the world.

From the circumstance (recorded by Mark) that during the absence of Jesus the scribes had mingled with the disciples, Neander infers that the transfiguration must have taken place in Galilee. But there is no reason for assuming that scribes had not also resided in the territory of the Jewish prince Philip.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The great contrast: Christ's transfiguration on the mount, and the scene of misery and unbelief in the valley below, here brought together in immediate contact. In the art of painting, Raphael has solved the difficult problem [in his famous *Transfiguration*, the last creation of his genius, representing Christ with Moses and Elijah in heavenly glory above, gazed at by the three favorite disciples at their feet, and the frightful scene of the lunatic below.—P. S.].

2. The disciples at the foot of the mountain were to be strengthened for the impending conflict in a manner quite different from that by which the three more intimate disciples of Jesus were prepared for it. They were to be taught and trained to stand alone. Still, despite their number, they were thrown into peculiar difficulties. At that particular season they were asked to cure a peculiarly severe case of demoniacal possession; they were surrounded by hostile scribes, ready to draw the worst inferences from their inability to afford relief, and to dispute with them; while the crowd of spectators were in danger of giving way to frivolity and derision. Hence, also, the multitude were greatly agitated when Christ appeared. The heavenly leader had to repair a severe defeat of His adherents. He accomplished it instantaneously and victoriously; thus at the same time both humbling their unbelief, and evoking and strengthening their faith. The three more intimate disciples of Jesus had been strengthened by the experience of communion with the blessed spirits of heaven. The rest were now strengthened along with them by witnessing the power of their Lord, which proved victorious over the worst demons of hell.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

How closely the Church of Christ borders on the precincts both of heaven and of hell!—Christ the King and Lord of all blessed spirits, and the conqueror of the lost.—In the Church of Christ it appears how both heaven and hell exert their influence upon earth.—The descent of the Lord and of His disciples into the valley: 1. Illustrated by the descent of travellers from bright mountain heights to dark gorges of valleys; 2. a lively image of the conflicting experiences realized by those who now descended from the mountain; 3. a foretoken of the descent of Christ into the kingdom of the dead.—The cure of the lunatic child itself a great victory, and accompanied by two other miracles. 1. This miracle was rendered more difficult—(*a*) by the character of the sufferer; (*b*) by the failure of the attempt made by the disciples; (*c*) by the malicious questions of the scribes; (*d*) by the presence of a perplexed multitude; (*e*) by the circumstance that the faith of the father of the child was shaken, although immediately restored. 2. The introductory miracle: the removal of the wrong state of feeling in the persons assembled, and of the inward dejection of the disciples. 3. The supplementary miracle: the rescuing of the child from the deadly stupor which proved all but fatal.—Although the Church of Christ may appear weak in many of its members, it always retains possession of miraculous power in its Lord.—How the disciples of Jesus ought to recover themselves from their unbelief, when they observe the loss of their power.—The error of the

disciples on the mount, and the error of those in the valley. The former wished to surrender themselves to the vision of heavenly objects, or to a merely contemplative life; the others ventured without sufficient faith upon the most trying conflict with the world and hell (attempting the cure, disputing with the scribes, and risking their reputation before the people).—"*If ye have faith as a grain of mustard*," etc.—In what order must our faith remove mountains? 1. First of all, the unbelief out of our own heart; 2. then unbelief in those who are disposed to believe; 3. after that, the unbelief of the world. The disciples miscarried in their work, because they reversed the right order.—We are to remove, first of all, the mountain which stands nearest in our path.—In this instance, the Jewish authorities had placed themselves in the way of the disciples as a mountain which they could not remove.—Faith can only achieve what it has recognized and felt as the will and call of God. But this it will certainly accomplish in the strength of the Lord.—Faith makes no *experiments*; what it undertakes is already decided and done in the counsel and power of God.—"*This kind goeth not out*," etc.—Prayer and fasting are the fundamental conditions of the victory of faith over the kingdom of darkness: 1. Prayer as faith, taking hold on the Lord and deriving strength from Him. 2. Fasting as faith in its practical renunciation of the world.—We can only overcome the spirit of melancholy in the world by a cheerful renunciation of the world.

Starke:—*J. Hall*: Felt need makes a man at once humble and eloquent.—Great is the misery of one bodily possessed; but infinitely greater that of one spiritually possessed.—*Canstein*: Satan makes use of natural causes (such as lunacy) for his designs.—There are, no doubt, even at the present day, many incurable diseases which are ascribed to natural causes (alone), and which yet may be (jointly) the effects of the invisible evil spirit.—*Quesnel*: God often allows His servants not to succeed in the cure of souls, partly as a judgment on these souls, and partly to humble and arouse His servants.—The indignation of Christ.—*Cramer*: His reproofs and chastisements, Ps. cxli. 5.—*Osiander*: If Jesus bears with our great weaknesses, should we not bear with those of our brethren? 1 Pet. iii. 8.—*Cramer*: Teachable scholars should be willing to acknowledge their dulness, and should often ask questions.—*Zeisius*: Unbelief stands in the way of the power and manifestations of the Lord, while faith at all times works miracles and removes mountains, if not materially, yet spiritually.—*Hedinger*: Behold how we must grapple with the powers of darkness.

Heubner:—The father of the lunatic, a consolatory example for poor parents who have children similarly afflicted.—They should seek help from Christ Himself.—The patience of Christ toward His disciples.—Let ministers ask themselves why they have so little success in their work.—We cannot expect to drive out the evil spirit, if our state of mind be in harmony with that which he produces.

F. *The Church in its human weakness.* CH. XVII. 22, 23.

(Mark ix. 30–32; Luke ix. 43–45.)

22 And, while they [again] abode[1] in Galilee, Jesus said unto them, The Son of man
shall be betrayed [is about to be given up, μέλλει παραδίδοσθαι] into the hands of men;
23 And they shall kill him [will put him to death], and the third day he shall be raised
[rise] again.[2] And they were exceeding sorry.

[1] Ver. 22.—Lachmann reads: συστρεφομένων [*to turn about with, to gather together*], with Cod. Vaticanus I. [and Cod. Sinaiticus], for ἀναστρεφομένων [*to return, to move about, to sojourn*]; Meyer regards it as a gloss to prevent ἀναστρεφομένων from being understood of return into Galilee; hence in the interest of the tradition of Tabor as the locality of the transfiguration. [So also Alford.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 23.—Lachmann, following Cod. B., etc., reads: ἀναστήσεται for ἐγερθήσεται. [But even if we read with Tischendorf and Alford: ἐγερθήσεται, it should be translated: *he shall rise*, as in ch. viii. 15, 26; ix. 6; xvi. 21; xvii. 7; xxv. 7, etc. In the N. T., and with later Greek writers, *verba media* in the reflective or intransitive sense, prefer the passive form of the aorist to the middle form. Comp. Alex. Buttmann: *Grammatik des neu-testamentlichen Sprachidioms*, p. 45, 49, and 165; also Robinson: *Lexic.*, sub ἐγείρω, middle intransitive, *to awake, to arise*.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 22. The expression ἀναστρεφομένων indicates that they had returned into Galilee. But as the former circumstances had not changed, the object of this visit must have been to prepare for the last journey of Jesus to Jerusalem.

The Lord was now ready, and His disciples were forewarned. Hence He returned to Galilee in order to commence the journey which was to bring Him to Golgotha. In all probability He did not pass over the sea, but went privately through Upper Galilee to His own country, as the expression παρεπορεύοντο in the Gospel of Mark seems to intimate, which has been understood by some as referring to bye-roads (Grotius). It was on this occasion that His brethren asked Him to attend the feast at Jerusalem—that He declined to go up with the company of pilgrims—that He privately went afterward, and unexpectedly made His appearance at the Feast of Tabernacles. Then followed the events connected with it, and His last visit to Capernaum, ver. 24.

Jesus said unto them.—Not a mere repetition of what He had formerly intimated to the disciples; for the term παραδίδοσθαι conveyed an additional element of information,—viz., that He was to be given up and surrendered,—an intimation which

was afterward more fully explained. Jesus passed privately through Galilee (Mark ix. 30). On this secret journey He prepared His disciples, in the wider sense of the term, for the issue before Him. An analogous expression, only more comprehensive, occurs in Matt. xx. 19.

Ver. 23. **And they were exceeding sorry.**—For further details, *see* the accounts in Mark and Luke. This communication, in its effects on the disciples, is not incompatible with the fact that Jesus had so clearly intimated His resurrection. Irrespective of its bearing upon them in their individual capacity, the announcement of Christ's crucifixion implied what would affect their views about the future of the world. The death of Jesus on the cross involved the destruction of their whole scheme—of their hopes of a Messianic temporal kingdom, and of their expectation of a state of immediate glory in this life.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The young and newly-formed band of members of Christ's Church now began to anticipate the immeasurable consequences of His course of suffering. Thus the transition from the Jewish to the Christian view of the relation between the first and second æon was preparing. A change such as this would necessarily be accompanied by manifold doubts, struggles, and conflicts.

2. It may be regarded as an evidence of the work of Christ in the hearts of His disciples, that they endured this conflict; nor can we wonder that, notwithstanding all this preparation, they felt deeply perplexed during the solemn and awful interval between the last supper and the resurrection.

3. Thus it seems as if, like a timorous fugitive, the Lord had to pass by mountain tracks and bye-roads through His native land, in order to prepare His friends for His impending sufferings.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The journey of Jesus through Galilee, now and formerly.—How everything wears a different aspect as the end draws nigh!—The secret journey of Jesus through His native land, a comfort to persecuted believers at all times.—How faithfully and calmly the Lord foretold His end to His disciples!—The Church of Jesus in its first human sorrow about the divine sufferings of Jesus: 1. The nature of this grief, in distinction from the peculiar sorrow about Christ's death: it was exalted, though not yet sacred. 2. Its form and expression. Contrast between the narrative in the gospel, and the festivals to commemorate the event, introduced by the mediæval Church. 3. Its ground: acquiescence in Christ's sufferings, implying the surrender of all worldly views, hopes, and expectations.—Difference between human and divine sorrow in connection with the cross.—Heavenly wisdom and strength of the Lord Jesus.—The Lion of the tribe of Judah did not hesitate to assume the appearance of a fugitive.—Like a chased roe upon the mountains, and yet Himself, 1. the Lamb, 2. the Lion.

Starke:—*Canstein*: When the time of our departure draws nigh, we should prepare our friends for it.—*Osiander*: How salutary is the remembrance of the cross!

Gossner:—Christ could not find attentive hearers, when preaching on the subject of His approaching death.

Heubner:—In mercy, God often grants us foretokens of heavy trials to come.

G. *The Church as free, and yet voluntarily subject, and paying Tribute to the ancient Temple at the time of its approaching end.* CH. XVII. 24–27.

24 And when they were come to Capernaum,[1] they that received [the receivers of the]
tribute *money* [τὰ δίδραχμα, *i. e.*, two drachmas, or half a shekel][2] came to Peter, and said,
25 Doth not your Master pay tribute [τὰ δίδραχμα]? He saith, Yes. And when he was
[had] come into the house, Jesus prevented him [anticipated him],[3] saying, What
thinkest thou, Simon? of whom do the kings of the earth take custom [customs, τέλη]
or tribute? of their own children [of their sons, ἀπὸ τῶν υἱῶν αὐτῶν],[4] or of strangers
26 [the other folks, τῶν ἀλλοτρίων, *i. e.*, those not of their household]?[5] Peter [he][6] saith
unto him, Of strangers. Jesus saith unto him, Then are the children [the sons, οἱ υἱοί]
27 free. Notwithstanding [But], lest we should offend them, go thou to the sea, and cast
a hook, and take up the fish that first cometh up; and when thou hast opened his
mouth, thou shalt find a piece of money [a stater, στατῆρα, *i. e.*, four drachmas, or one shekel]:
that take, and give unto them for me and thee.

[1] Ver. 24.—Different readings, but of no bearing on the sense.

[2] Ver. 24.—[*Tribute-money* and *tribute* is a generalizing explanatory rendering of τὰ δίδραχμα, lit.: *the double drachma*, or what is its equivalent in Hebrew, *the half-shekel*. The definite article means: the obligatory, customary. Tyndale, the Geneva, and the Bishops' Bible translate: *poll-money*; Cranmer, and King James's Revisers: *tribute-money*; the Rheims Version: *the didrachmes*; Campbell: *the didrachma*; Archbishop Newcombe, Norton, Conant, and the revised N. T. of the A. B. U.: *the half-shekel*. Luther: *Zinsgroschen*; de Wette, van Ess, Allioli: *die Doppeldrachme*; Ewald: *Zinsgulden* (with the note: *jährliche Tempelsteuer*); Lange: *Doppeldrachma*, and in parenthesis: *Tempelsteuer*. In the English Bible the term *double drachma*, or *half-shekel*, might be retained with a marginal

note: *the annual tribute to the temple*, or *the temple-tax*. As our Authorized Version now stands, the relation between the value of the annual temple-offering (2 drachmas or half a shekel) and the piece of money miraculously supplied, ver. 27 (4 drachmas or a shekel), is lost to the English reader.—P. S.]

[3] Ver. 25.—[Προέφθασεν αὐτόν, from προφθάνω, *to prevent, to forestall*, which occurs only here in the N. T.; but the verb simplex φθάνειν occurs seven times. The English Version (since Cranmer), here as also in 1 Thess. iv. 15 (*we shall not prevent*, μὴ φθάσωμεν, *them who are asleep*), and several times in the O. T., uses the word *prevent* in the old English sense = *prævenire, to come* or *go before, to precede* (so also in the Common Prayer Book: "*Prevent* us, O Lord, in all our doings, with Thy most gracious favor"); but now it has just the opposite meaning *to hinder, to obstruct*. On the contrary the old English verb *to let*, which is used in the E. V. of 2 Thess. ii. 7 for κατέχειν, *to hold back, to detain, to hinder, to prevent*, and in Rom. i. 13 for κωλύειν (*was let*, *i. e.*, prevented, *hitherto*), is now only used in the sense *to permit, to leave* (*lassen*); or also *to lease*. In such cases, which, however, are very rare, the common reader of the Bible is apt to be misled and should be guarded by marginal notes. Campbell renders our passage: *before he spake, Jesus said to him*; Norton: *before he had spoken of it, Jesus said to him*; Tyndale, the Genevan Bible, Wakefield, Conant better: *Jesus spake first, saying*. But our *anticipated him* is more literal and corresponds with the usual German Version: *kam ihm zuvor*, etc.—P. S.]

[4] Ver. 25.—[*Sons* is more expressive here, especially in view of the bearing of the analogy on the Sonship of Christ (*see* my footnote on ver. 26), than *children*, or *Kinder* as Luther has it. Ewald and Lange, also, translate: *Söhne*. The possessive *own* of the E. V. is hardly necessary (although Lange, too, inserts in smaller type *eigenen*), and might convey the false idea that the contrast was between the children of the kings and the *children* of others, while the contrast is between the princes and subjects, or the rulers and the ruled.—P. S.]

[5] Ver. 25.—[*Strangers*, like the *alieni* of the Vulgate and the *Fremde* of Luther's and Ewald's versions, is almost too strong a term for ἀλλότριοι, which in this connection means simply those who are not υἱοὶ τῶν βασιλέων, who do not belong to the royal household. Hammond (one of the best of the older English commentators) renders: *other folks*; de Wette and Lange: *andere Leute*. I would prefer *subjects* if it were not too free.—P. S.]

[6] Ver. 26.—Πέτρος is omitted in B., D., etc. [Also in Cod. Sinaiticus and in all the modern critical editions.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Circumstances connected with this event.—Jesus had returned from the Feast of Tabernacles at Jerusalem. He had explained the symbolical import of the temple service, and shown how it was fulfilled in His own life. The drawing of water (John vii. 37); the lighting up of the temple (ch. viii.); the temple as His Father's residence, where He appeared as the King's Son; the fountain of Siloah (ch. ix.); the theocracy itself (ch. x.)—all pointed to Him. Immediately afterward, the Jews had brought, before the ecclesiastical tribunal, the man born blind, whom Jesus had restored, and finally excommunicated him (ix. 34); which implied that Jesus Himself had been excommunicated previous to this event, probably ever since the cure of the lame man at the pool of Bethesda (ch. v.). The Lord now waited in retirement at Capernaum for the next festive season. So far as we know, He performed no further miracles in Galilee. The cure of the man afflicted with dropsy, which occurred at the end of this period, took place under very peculiar circumstances (Luke xiv. 1–24). From the retirement of the Lord, His enemies might almost have inferred that He now intended to settle down in Galilee, to give up His work, and to submit in silence to the institutions of the land.

Ver. 24. **The receivers or collectors of the didrachmas**, or **the double drachma.**—The demand of the temple-tax from Jesus, although primarily addressed to Peter, forms a contrast to the relation in which Jesus had placed Himself toward the temple when in Jerusalem. The Lord, who was the living and real Temple, was to pay tribute to the types and shadows of this reality, or to the legal symbols of the temple. According to Exod. xxx. 13; 2 Chron. xxiv. 6, Joseph. *Antiq.* 18, 9 (*see* Wetstein, Michaelis, and Ewald, *Alterthümer*, 320), every male from twenty years old was obliged to pay half a shekel yearly for the temple service. This half shekel was equal to two Attic drachmas (one shekel = four Attic drachmas, Joseph. *Antiq.* iii. 8, 2). According to the LXX. (Gen. xxiii. 15; Josh. vii. 21), the Alexandrian drachma was equal to half a shekel. The whole shekel amounted to about 2*s.* 6*d.* sterling, or about 60 cents in American money.* After the destruction of Jerusalem, this tax went to the Roman capitol. It was due in the month Adar (March). Hence it may be inferred that Jesus was in arrears. The supposition of Wieseler (*Chronol. Synopse*, p. 264), that the demand for the temple tribute was only made about the time when it was actually due, and that it must hence have been a Roman tax, is erroneous. Local payments might be delayed by absence. (The same remark may also apply in reference to the objection, that the presentation of the infant Jesus must necessarily have taken place before the flight into Egypt.) The use of the solemn term τὰ δίδραχμα indicates that it was a religious, not a secular tax; the plural number implying, as Meyer observes, that it was annually and regularly levied, not that on this occasion it was asked both for the Lord and His disciples. Besides, the supposition of a Roman impost would be entirely incompatible with the reasoning of the Saviour. Of course, ideas derived from the theocracy could not have been applied to the Roman government. This act of the officials of the temple may be regarded as an indication of the feeling of the priests. The servants began to act rudely toward Jesus, who had become an offence to their superiors. Still, there is a certain amount of good-natured simplicity about their conduct, and it almost seems as if they fancied that Jesus was about quietly to settle down in Capernaum.

Doth not your Master pay the double drachma?—Manifestly presupposing the expectation that He would pay—not, as some have supposed, a doubt, that, since priests and Levites were free, He might wish to claim a similar exemption.

Ver. 25. **Jesus anticipated him.**—This antici-

* [Dr. Lange estimates the value of the *shekel* at 21 *gute Groschen* or more (afterward, *Note* on ver. 27, at 23 to 24 Groschen or about a Prussian *dollar*). But its value is differently estimated from 2*s.* 3*d.* to over 3*s.* sterling, or from 50 to 70 cents. Before the Babylonian exile the shekel was only a certain weight of silver, since the time of the Maccabees (1 Macc. xv. 6) a coined money; but as these coins grew scarce, it became customary to estimate the temple dues (a half shekel) as two drachmas. It must not be confounded with the gold coin, more accurately called shekel, which was equal not to four, but to twenty Attic drachmas. *See* the Dictionaries, *sub* שֶׁקֶל, σίκλος, *Shekel*, also *sub* δίδραχμα and ἀργύριον, especially WINER, *sub Sekel* (*Bibl. Realwörterbuch*, vol. ii., 443 sqq.); W. SMITH, *sub Money* (*Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. ii., 404 sqq.); and Dr. M. A. LEVY: *Geschichte der jüdischen Münzen*, Breslau, 1862 (which is mentioned as an important work in Smith's *Dict.*, *sub Shekel*, vol. iii., p. 1246; but which I have not seen myself).—P. S.]

pation implies a miraculous knowledge of Peter's *assent.* Τέλη, *vectigalia,* duties on merchandize, customs; κῆνσος, *capitation* or *land-tax.* [Peter's affirmative answer to the tax-gatherers was rather hasty, and lost sight for a while of the royal dignity and prerogative of his Master, who was a Son in His own house, the temple, and not a servant in another's, and who could claim the offerings in the name of His Father.—P. S.]

Or of strangers.—Not of the princes, but of their subjects.

Ver. 26. **Then are the Sons free.**—A conclusion *a minori ad majus.* The earthly royal prerogative serves as a figure of theocratic right. God is King of the temple-city; hence His Son is free from any ecclesiastical tribute.*—De Wette regards the passage as involving some difficulties, since Jesus had disowned every outward and earthly claim in His character as Messiah, and had become subject to the law.† Accordingly, this critic suggests that Jesus had only intended to reprove the rashness of Peter's promise, and to suggest the thought to him (as he was still entangled with Jewish legalism), that, in point of law, the demand made upon Him was not valid. On the other hand, Olshausen maintains that Jesus asserted His exaltation over the temple-ritual (as in ch. xii. 8: The Son of Man is Lord of the Sabbath—One greater than the temple). Meyer reminds us, that although as Messiah Jesus was above the law, yet in His infinite condescension He submitted to its demands. This explanation is so far more satisfactory. But commentators seem to forget that the breach between the ancient theocracy and the ἐκκλησία had already begun in Judæa and Galilee, and that Jesus had entered on His path of sufferings. It was inconsistent to reject, and virtually (though perhaps not formally) to excommunicate Jesus, and yet at the same time to demand from Him the temple tribute. And in this sense the Apostles themselves were included among the υἱοί (in the plural). They were to share in the suffering and in the excommunication of their Master. Paulus and Olshausen apply the expression to Peter in connection with Jesus; Meyer regards it as a *locus communis* referring to Jesus alone, since, in the argument as used in the text, it could only designate the Lord Himself. But, according to the Apostle Paul, believers have fellowship with Christ in virtue of their υἱοθεσία, and in Him are free from the law. "The Roman Catholic Church employs this passage to prove the freedom of the clergy from taxation, at least in reference to ecclesiastical charges" (Meyer). In our opinion, it would be more appropriate to deduce from it the freedom of the living Church from the burdens of the law. [The inference of the Roman Catholics would prove too much, viz., the freedom of all the children of God from taxation.—P. S.]

Ver. 27. **But lest we should offend them.**—Meyer refers the latter expression to the tax-gatherers: Lest we should lead them to suppose that we despise the temple. As, in dealing with the Pharisees (ch. xv.), Christ did not avoid giving them offence, we are led to infer that in the present instance it would have been an offence to "these little ones." Besides the tax-gatherers, many other persons in Capernaum, who could not clearly apprehend the spiritual bearing of Christ's conduct, might readily have taken offence, under the impression that He placed Himself in opposition to the temple.

A piece of money, lit.: **a stater.**—A coin = 4 drachmas, or about a Prussian dollar [or rather less, about 60 cents].

Various views are entertained in reference to this *miracle.* 1. De Wette contents himself with calling attention to the difficulties connected with the orthodox view of the narrative (the miracle was unnecessary; it was unworthy of Jesus, since He had on no other occasion performed a miracle for His own behoof; it was impossible, since a fish could not have carried a stater in its mouth, and yet bite at the hook, as Strauss misstated the case). 2. Paulus and Ammon have attempted to represent it as a natural event. Thus Paulus paraphrases the language of Jesus: When thou openest the mouth of this fish to detach the hook, it will be found worth a stater. [A wonderful price for a fish caught with a hook!] Or, If there on the spot (αὐτοῦ) you open the mouth to offer the fish, etc. 3. Strauss characterizes it as a myth, derived from legends connected with the lake of Galilee.* Similarly, Hase represents it as figurative language, referring to the success accompanying the exercise of their calling, which tradition had afterward transformed into a miraculous event. 5. Ewald makes the curious comment, that we do not read of Peter having actually caught such a fish, but that the saying was one which might be readily employed, as pieces of money had sometimes been found in fishes. 6. It has been regarded as a miracle, in the proper sense of the term. (*a*) As a miracle of *power,* directly performed. The fish was made to fetch the coin from the deep, and then to come up to the hook. So Bengel.† Or, (*b*) As a miracle of *knowledge* on

* [In Latin the intimate relation between sonship and freedom might be thus rendered: *Liberi sunt liberi.* The plural υἱοί is necessitated by the figure of the "*kings* of the earth," and does not interfere with Christ's unique position as the only begotten of the Father, but rather establishes it by way of analogy, since there is but one King in heaven. Grotius: "*Plurali numero utitur, non quod ad alios eam extendat libertatem, sed quod comparatio id exigebat, sumta non ab unius sed ab omnium regum more ac consuetudine.*" Trench: "It is just as natural, when we come to the heavenly order of things which is there shadowed forth, to restrain it to the singular, to the one Son; since to the King of heaven, who is set against the kings of the earth, there is but one, the only begotten of the Father." Observe also in ver. 27 He says not: *for us,* putting Himself on a par with Peter, but: *for Me and thee;* comp. John xx. 17: "unto *My* Father, and *your* Father," and His uniform address to God: "*My* (not: *Our*) Father," all of which implies His unique relation to the Father.—P. S.]

† [This objection of de Wette rests on a false assumption and is inconsistent with his own admission, in his note on ver. 24, that the temple-tax was a theocratic or religious, not a civil, tax, a tribute to God, not to Cæsar. Many commentators—Origen, Augustine, Jerome, Maldonatus, Corn. a Lapide, Wolf, even Wieseler (*Chronol. Synopse,* p. 265), and others—have overlooked and denied this fact and missed the whole meaning of the miracle by the false assumption that this money was a civil tribute to the Roman emperor, like the penny mentioned on a later occasion, Matt. xxii. 19. The word *tribute* in the E. V. rather favors this error. The emperor Vespasian converted the temple-tax into an imperial tribute, but this was after the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple, as Josephus expressly states, *De Bello Jud.* vii. 6, 6.—P. S.]

* [Strauss profanely calls it "*den mährchenhaften Ausläufer der See-Anekdoten,*" and in his new *Life of Jesus,* 1864, p. 84, he endeavors to ridicule Dr. Ebrard for supposing, very unnecessarily, that the fish spit the piece of money from the stomach into the throat the moment Peter opened its mouth. In this case there is no assignable occasion, or Old Testament precedent, or possible significancy of a mythical fiction.—P. S.]

† [So also Trench (*Notes on the Miracles,* p. 885): "The miracle does not lie in the mere foreknowledge on the Lord's part as to how it should be with the fish which came up; but He Himself, by the mysterious potency of His will which ran through all nature, drew the particular fish to that spot at that moment, and ordained that it should swallow the hook. We may compare Jonah i. 17: 'The Lord

the part of Jesus. So Grotius and Meyer. Adopting the latter explanation, we would call attention to the fact, that in performing this miracle the Lord was equally careful to maintain His rights as King of Zion, and to avoid giving offence. Hence the tribute, for which Peter himself was naturally liable, was to be procured through the personal exertions of that Apostle. But, as in this case he acted as the representative of the Lord, the money was miraculously provided. All the requirements of the case seem to us sufficiently met by the fact, that Jesus predicted that the first draught of Peter would yield the sum needed. Hence the words, "*When thou hast opened his mouth*," might almost be regarded as a metaphor for "when thou takest off the hook"—in which case it would imply simply a prediction that Peter would catch a very large and valuable fish. But the statement, that he would *find* a piece of money, conveys to our minds that the Apostle was to discover the *stater* in the inside of the fish. The main point of the narrative, however, lies in this, that the stater was to be miraculously provided. By his rashness, Peter had apparently placed the Lord in the difficulty of either giving offence, or else of virtually declaring Himself subject to tribute. Under these circumstances, the Lord looked and descried the stater in the lake; and the *miraculous* provision thus procured might serve both for Himself and for Peter.

had prepared a great fish to swallow up Jonah.' Thus we see the sphere of animal life unconsciously obedient to His will; that also is not *out* of God, but moves *in* Him, as does every other creature. 1 Kings xiii. 24; xx. 36; Amos ix. 3." Yet Trench does not assume that the *stater* was miraculously created for the occasion, but brought in contact with the fish by a miraculous coincidence.—P. S.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. We have here a remarkable instance of the vast difference between giving offence to the "little ones" and to the Pharisees. Similarly, we learn from the narrative that Christian wisdom must be able to discover a way out of every seeming conflict of duties, since such conflicts can only be apparent, not real.

2. It were a great mistake to suppose, that because Matthew does not record that Peter actually caught the fish, found and paid the stater, all this did not really take place. But, on the other hand, we infer from this omission, that the great object of the Evangelist was to record the spiritual import, rather than the outward circumstances, of this event. It was intended to set before the Apostles the principle which should regulate the future relations between the free Church of the gospel and the ancient legal community at the time of the cessation of its services and ritual. The point here lies in the contrast between the sons of the King, or of the true theocracy, and mere subjects, who in the text are very significantly called ἀλλότριοι, *strangers*. Christ and His people are the children of the kingdom; the Jewish legalists its subjects, or rather its bondsmen. (Comp. John viii. 35: The servant abideth not for ever in the house, or in the temple; but the Son abideth there for ever.)

3. "The children of the kingdom, who themselves are the living temple, could not be made outwardly or legally subject to the typical services of the temple. As the free children of God, they were superior to all such bondage. But perhaps some historical claim might yet be urged upon them, or else they were not to shock the prejudices of some of these 'little ones' (comp. Matt. xviii.). Hence, in all such cases, it was their duty to avoid giving offence, and to perform what was expected from them. But in so doing, they would display such joyousness, freedom, and princely grandeur, as to vindicate their liberty even in the act of submitting to what might seem its temporary surrender" (*Leben Jesu*, iii. p. 170). It is scarcely necessary to add, that by professing adherence to a particular ecclesiastical system, we, as Christians, incur the obligation of contributing to its support. Every such profession is a voluntary obligation, which, among other things, implies the duty of outwardly contributing for its maintenance.

4. There is something peculiarly characteristic of Peter in this history. With his usual rashness, he would make the Lord Jesus legally subject to tribute. This obligation he has now himself to discharge, and that by means of a fish (the symbol of a Christian) which is found to have unnaturally swallowed a stater.

5. In this instance, also, Christ did not perform a miracle "for His own behoof," but as a sign for others.

[TRENCH (*Notes on the Miracles*, p. 379): "Here, as so often in the life of our Lord, the depth of His poverty and humiliation is lighted up by a gleam of His glory; while, by the manner of His payment, He reasserted the true dignity of His person, which else by the payment itself was in danger of being obscured and compromised in the eyes of some. The miracle, then, was to supply a real need, . . . differing in its essence from the apocryphal miracles, which are so often mere sports and freaks of power, having no ethical motive or meaning whatever."—P. S.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The great danger of the servants of Christ to attempt bringing Him, in His Church, in subjection to tradition.—The outward, secular subjection of the children of God under outward temple ordinances, a contradiction. 1. In general: they who possess the reality, are expected to be in subjection to shadows. 2. In a special sense: it is required of the stones of the living temple to maintain the symbolical temple buildings, of the living sacrifices to promote the typical sacrifices, of the children of the Spirit to maintain the emblems of spiritual things.—Contradiction of hierarchism: it excommunicates and yet levies tax upon the children of the Spirit.—Cupidity of the mediæval Church in seeking the fortunes and possessions of those who were stigmatized as heretics.—Important consequences implied in the rash assent given by Peter.—How Christ avoided giving offence to devout prejudices, Rom. xiv. 13.—The humility and the glory of Christ in paying the temple-tribute. —How Christians, in bearing witness to their faith, may preserve their liberty while voluntarily surrendering it for the sake of charity.—The three draughts of Peter.—How Christians (fishes) who have the world (a piece of money) in their hearts, may be caught and made subservient to outward ordinances.—A Christian will always find a miraculous way of escape through the intricate mazes of apparently conflicting duties.—The Lord prepares a way even in our greatest difficulties, viz., those of conscience.—If we have anticipated the Lord, we must submit to severe tests

of our obedience.—How the Lord can most gloriously repair the damage done by His people by their rash anticipations of His decisions.

Starke:—Quesnel: Jesus humbles Himself, and submits to all human ordinances. (The text, however, does not refer either to the payment of civil taxes or to any secular arrangements.)—Let us avoid giving offence to any one.—Let us avoid the appearance of evil.—*Canstein:* It does not matter though the children of God may not possess what they require; God will care for them (though the text does not imply that the whole company of disciples at Capernaum did not possess the small sum of about three shillings demanded of them).—*Zeisius:* Christ, Lord over all His creatures, even in His estate of humiliation.

Gerlach:—While Jesus never forgot, from false humility, what was due to Him, He only manifested His dignity before those who were capable of understanding Him, and at the same time was willing to become the servant of all.

Heubner:—Ministers must be ready to prove that they really despise earthly things.—Humiliation and exaltation combined in this event.—We may submit to civil oppression even while preserving in our minds and hearts our dignity and rights.

SECOND SECTION.

THE PRIESTLY ORDER IN THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

Chapter XVIII. 1-35.

Contents:—This section furnishes a sketch of the Church in its *priestly*, or in its strictly ecclesiastical, relations. The basis of these is the hierarchy of the service of love (ch. xviii. 1-14). Rising on this foundation, the Church is to display, on the one hand, spiritual earnestness by its discipline (vers. 15-20), and, on the other, spiritual gentleness by its absolution (vers. 21-35). This delineation of the *priestly* character of the Church is continued in the next section, which treats of marriage in the Church, of children in the Church, and of property in the Church.

Historical Succession.—The scene is still in Galilee, and in all likelihood at Capernaum. Once more had the hopes of the disciples been raised, probably in connection with the late miracles of Jesus in Judea and Galilee, and from a misunderstanding of His calmness and of the declaration which He had made when providing the tribute-money. Friends now gather around the Lord, preparatory to going up to Jerusalem. The disciples discuss the question of the primacy in the kingdom of heaven. This dispute (to ver. 5) was no doubt occasioned, if not by the confession, yet by the general position, of Peter. According to Mark ix. 38, John now gave occasion to the saying of Christ about offences (vers. 6 sqq.). Lastly, the question of Peter again evoked the teaching of Christ concerning absolution, and the parable connected with it. On comparing the corresponding passages in Matthew, Mark, and Luke, we conclude that the sayings and events recorded in chap. xviii. belong to the period of Christ's stay at Capernaum. Of course, in holding this view, we imply at the same time that the Lord uttered on two different occasions the parable concerning the hundred sheep. These transactions were followed by the commencement of the journey to Jerusalem.

A. *The Hierarchy of the service of Love.* Ch. XVIII. 1-14.

(*The Gospel for St. Michael*, ch. xviii. 1-11.—Parallels: Mark ix. 33-50; Luke xv. 4-7; xvii. 1, 2.)

1 At the same time [At that time, ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ][1] came the disciples unto Jesus,
2 saying, Who [then, ἄρα] is the greatest[2] in the kingdom of heaven? And Jesus called
3 a little child unto him, and set him in the midst of them, And said, Verily I say unto
you, Except ye be converted [Unless ye turn],[3] and become as little children, ye shall
4 not enter into the kingdom of heaven. Whosoever therefore shall humble himself[4] as
5 this little child, the same is greatest in the kingdom of heaven. And whoso shall re-
6 ceive one such child in my name receiveth me. But whoso shall offend [give offence to,
σκανδαλίσῃ] one of these little ones which [that] believe in me, it were better for him

[it profiteth him, yea for this][5] that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and *that*
7 he were drowned [plunged] in the depth[6] of the sea. Woe unto the world because
of offences [ἀπὸ τῶν σκανδάλων]! for it must needs be that offences come;[7] but woe to
8 that [the][8] man by whom the offence cometh! Wherefore if [But if, εἰ δέ] thy hand
or thy foot offend thee, cut them [it][9] off, and cast *them* from thee: it is better for thee
to enter into life halt or maimed, rather than having two hands or two feet to be cast
9 into everlasting fire. And if thine eye offend thee, pluck it out, and cast *it* from thee:
it is better for thee to enter into life with one eye, rather than having two eyes to be
10 cast into hell fire. Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones; for I say
unto you, That in heaven their angels [their angels in heaven][10] do always behold the
11 face of my Father which [who] is in heaven. For the Son of man is come to save that
12 which was lost.[11] How [What] think ye? if a man have a hundred sheep, and one
of them be gone astray, doth he not leave the ninety and nine, and goeth into the
mountains, and seeketh [doth he not leave the ninety-nine upon the mountains, and go
13 and seek][12] that which is gone astray? And if so be [if it be, ἐὰν γένηται] that he find
it, verily I say unto you, he rejoiceth more of that *sheep* [more over it, ἐπ' αὐτῷ μᾶλλον],
14 than of [over] the ninety and nine which [that] went not astray. Even so it is not the
will of your Father which [who] is in heaven, that one of these little ones should perish
[that . . . perish, ἵνα . . . ἀπόληται].

[1] Ver. 1.—Lachmann reads ἡμέρᾳ (*day*) for ὥρᾳ (*hour*), according to certain authorities of Origen. Less attested. [Origen leaves the matter undecided, saying simply: κατὰ μέν τινα τῶν ἀντιγράφων ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ προσῆλθον οἱ μαθηταὶ τῷ Ἰησοῦ, κατὰ δὲ ἄλλα ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ. Cod. Sinait. with the great majority of witnesses read ὥρᾳ, which has been retained by Tischendorf and Alford.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 1.—[Literally: *greater* (than others, or the rest), *major;* Lange: *der Grössere.* It is a superlative in effect, though not in form. The English idiom requires here the superlative, as μικρότερος in Matt. xi. 11 is correctly rendered in the Authorized Version: *he that is least*, etc. Comp. my notes on pp. 205 and 206.—P. S.]

[3] Ver. 3.—[Ἐὰν μὴ στραφῆτε, equivalent as to sense to μετανοῆτε. The older English trsls., Tyndale, Coverdale, Cranmer, Rogers, the Genevan N. T. of 1557, the Bishops' Bible, also Conant, the N. T. of the A. B. U. (1864) unanimously render: *except ye turn;* Luther: *es sei denn, dass ihr umkehret* (Luther, however, inserts *euch*, which is omitted in some modern editions); Lange: *wenn ihr nicht umgekehrt seid.* The Authorized Version: *except ye be converted*, is derived from the ed. of the Genevan Bible of 1560. Similarly the Rheims' New Test. of 1582: *unless ye be converted.* Campbell and Norton translate: *unless ye be changed.* Στρέφεσθαι, *to turn oneself*, is here evidently used as a term for conversion under the figure of *turning back* from a path previously pursued, or a return to our proper and normal relation to God, as His obedient and confiding children. It is thus equivalent to μετανοεῖν, *to change the mind*, which implies repentance and faith. Lange presses the aorist (*unless ye shall have turned*), as implying that the disciples were already converted and needed only to be confirmed. *See* his *Exeg. Notes.* But the Saviour refers here more particularly to a return of His disciples from the path of *ambitious rivalry*, which is implied in the question of ver. 1, to a spirit of *childlike simplicity and humility.* Conversion may be repeated and should be repeated after every fall, but regeneration cannot be repeated any more than natural birth. Conversion is the act of man (under the influence of the Holy Spirit), regeneration is the act of God.—P. S.]

[4] Ver. 4.—Lachmann and Tischendorf [and Alford] adopt the future ταπεινώσει [for the *lect. rec.* ταπεινώσῃ], after Codd. B., D., Z., etc.

[5] Ver. 6.—[This is a more literal translation of συμφέρει αὐτῷ, and corresponds with Dr. Lange's Version: *es nützt ihm—ja dazu.* Comp. his *Exeg. Note* below. But for popular use I would prefer the Authorized Version: *it were better for him*, and Luther's Version: *dem wäre es besser*, which Ewald retained, while de Wette renders: *ihm frommte es.*—P. S.]

[6] Ver. 6.—[Ἐν πελάγει, literally: *the high, the open, the deep sea*, as distinct from the shallows near the shore. Lange: *auf der Höhe* (*in die Tiefe*) *des Meeres.* The *drowning* is a necessary consequence of being plunged in the high sea with a mill-stone around the neck, but is not necessarily implied in καταποντίζω, *to cast* or *sink down in the sea* (πόντος).—P. S.]

[7] Ver. 7.—[Dr. Lange inserts here in the text in smaller type: *geworden—historisches Gerichtsverhängniss*, i. e., scandals have *become* (are not originally) necessary, as a *judgment of history.*—P. S.]

[8] Ver. 7.—[Lachmann and Tregelles with some of the oldest authorities, to which must now be added also the Codex from Mt. Sinai, omit ἐκείνῳ after τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ. Lange translates accordingly: *wehe* DEM *Menschen*, but does not notice the difference of reading. Tischendorf and Alford, however, retain ἐκείνῳ.—P. S.]

[9] Ver. 8.—B., D., L., and many other Codd., read αὐτόν (*it*) for αὐτά, which looks like an emendation. [The former conforms in gender to the nearest noun, but as to sense refers to both.]

[10] Ver. 10.—[The order in the Greek: οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτῶν ἐν οὐρανοῖς. The order of the E. V. misleads, as if *in heaven* belonged to the verb.—P. S.]

[11] Ver. 11.—[Ἦλθε γὰρ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός] is omitted by Lachmann and Tischendorf, on the authority of Codd. B., L., I., [Cod. Sinait. likewise omits it], and in some ancient versions. But it is found in Cod. G., al., and required by the connection. It was perhaps omitted, as de Wette suggests, to avoid the appearance of numbering the children with the lost. [It is generally supposed that ver. 11 is an insertion from Luke xix. 10, but there is no good reason for such insertion, and it is made improbable by the omission of the verb ζητῆσαι of Luke before σῶσαι (*to seek and* save), which would have suited the ζητεῖ of ver. 12. *See* Alford, who retains the received text.—P. S.]

[12] Ver. 12.—[This is the proper construction, connecting ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρη with ἀφείς. So the Vulgate (*nonne relinquit nonagintanovem in montibus, et vadit*, etc.), the Peschito, Luther, Bengel, de Wette, Ewald, Lange, Wiclif, Tyndale (*doeth he not leave ninety nine in the mountains, and go and seek*), Cranmer, Genevan, Rheims Vers., Campbell, Conant, etc. The error in the Authorized Version seems to be derived from the Bishops' Bible, where I find it. Ἐπί with the accusative suits the verb ἀφείς and the idea of a flock of sheep scattered over a mountain. Lachmann reads ἀφήσει—καὶ πορευθείς, *will he not leave—and going seek*, etc. (instead of ἀφεὶς—πορευθείς). Dr. Lange, following this reading, stops the question with ὄρη. Objectionable.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1. **At that hour.**—Referring to the hour in which the transaction about the tribute-money took place. The Messianic hopes of the disciples had been greatly raised, both by that miracle, and by the explanation of Jesus as to His relation to the theocracy.

Who then is the greatest? τίς ἄρα.—The inference implied in ἄρα seems to allude to Peter, who had apparently again been honored by an extraordinary distinction.—The **greater** (*major*), in relation to all others, is the first. The *Major Domus*, or the *Primus*. Who **is**? in the present tense. From the statement of the Lord, that, as Son of the King, He was free from the legal obligations of the theocracy, they inferred that the kingdom of the Messiah was already founded. Besides, the question was evidently also intended for the purpose of eliciting a distinct statement on that subject.

Ver. 2. **A little child.**—A little boy. According to [a late and unreliable] tradition, the martyr Ignatius; according to Paulus, an orphan; according to Bolten, one of the young ministering disciples. Each of these views appears to us strained. The main point was, that He set before them a *little child*.

Ver. 3. **Except ye be converted,*** etc.—The use of the aorist tenses deserves special notice. Jesus presupposes that all this had already taken place in His disciples—that they were converted, had become like children, and entered into the kingdom of heaven. Hence He refers only to the necessity of self-examination and probation, not to that of a new conversion. We note the antithesis in the expressions, "*the greatest in the kingdom of heaven*," and "*entering into the kingdom of heaven*." The meaning is: The first question which you should put, is about your having entered into the kingdom of heaven. If they had entered it, they had become like the child before them; in which case their question could only have been caused by temporary surprise. Hence, if any one should display hierarchical tendencies, or give vent to such feelings, the question would naturally arise, whether he was really converted at all. More than that, the statement implies that in a certain sense all hierarchism is opposed to, and incompatible with, the kingdom of heaven. In John iii. 3, 5, this condition of entering the kingdom of heaven is put in the present tense, and more strongly expressed, as being born again. Conversion, being a complete turning in moral respects, implies a new birth so far as its divine cause and the totality of the change are concerned; while, so far as its moral aspects and its claims to acknowledgment are concerned, it may be described as becoming children.

Ver. 4. **Whosoever therefore shall humble himself as this little child.**—Whoso will appear humble and small, like this child; not, humble himself like this child. Valla: *iste parvulus non se humiliat, sed humilis est.* The use of the future tense shows that something of this kind was now again to take place in the disciples as the condition of their future greatness. The expressions of the Saviour prove that the point of the comparison lay in the modesty of the child, in its want of pretension, which enabled it to enjoy whatever came before it, without seeking or claiming more as its due. The real greatness of the child consists in its perfect contentment with its littleness and dependence. By our outward demands and our claims upon the future, we only lose the present, and with it, both life and reality; while the want of pretension and care in the child secures to it, with each passing moment, the enjoyment of life. And this constitutes also the condition of its future greatness. If the child aimed at anything beyond the limits of its capacity, such a claim would of itself ensure disappointment. This absence of pretension in the disciple of Christ constitutes true humility, to which, even after our conversion, we must ever and again revert. Only by thus reverting to our littleness before God and the brethren, can we hope to realize the life of the kingdom of God, or to enter upon the path of development and future greatness. The use of the simple future (ταπεινώσει) seems to indicate that this conversion would take place at a later period in the history of the disciples, and especially in that of Peter. In this connection, the reader will also recall the last hours of Jesus.—**The greatest.**—According to the measure of humility, and *each one according to his own idiosyncrasy.*

Ver. 5. **And whoso shall receive** [*even* or *only*] **one such little child.**—The consequence and evidence of humility is, to receive one such little child. The question has been raised, Whether we are to understand the terms in a literal or in a spiritual sense, in other words, of a child in years, or of a child in spirit, as just described. The former view is adopted by Bengel, Paulus, Neander, and de Wette; the latter, by Erasmus, Beza, Calvin, Grotius, and Meyer. But it could scarcely be regarded as a special evidence of humility, to receive in the name of Jesus a Christian of such marked humility. Besides, the context and Matt. xxv. are in favor of the former view. It is the most honorable office in the kingdom of heaven to receive the King Himself; hence our Lord says: This distinguished office commences even when you receive a child in My name (comp. John xxi. 15, and the end of Gerson's life*). But this does not imply that the Saviour here referred to a natural, in opposition to a spiritual, child. Even a poor negro, who is desirous of being admitted into the school of Christ, may be such a child. In general, the expression applies to those who are apparently small, as contrasted with those who are apparently great, in the kingdom of heaven; hence, to catechumens and Sunday-school scholars, or to those who receive instruction, in opposition to those who impart it—to the Church under guidance, in opposition to that part of it which guides. The real glory of office, and the real primacy of the Apostles, was to appear in their spiritual service and in their condescension to those who were small, in the care of the Lamb of Christ in the school and the catechetical class. And this promise applied in all its fulness to such service of love, even in a single case.—*Shall receive*, *i. e.*, into spiritual fellowship.

* [In Germ.: *Wenn ihr nicht umgekehrt seid, unless ye shall have turned.* Comp. the *Critical Note*, No. 8, p. 322.—P. S.]

* [Dr. Lange refers here to the celebrated John Charlier Gerson, who was chancellor of the university of Paris and the theological leader of the reformatory councils of Pisa (1409) and Constance (1415). After taking a prominent part in all the great questions of his age, he retired to a convent at Lyons, and found his chief delight in the instruction of little children. As he felt the approach of death, he called once more the children that they might pray with him: Lord of mercy, have mercy upon Thy poor servant! He appears greater in this humility, than when he swayed by his eloquence the council of bishops. He died A. D. 1429, 66 years old.—P. S.]

In My name.—Properly, on the ground of My name; the fellowship of faith combining and uniting the teacher and the taught in the name of Christ. Hence, neither referring exclusively to the faith of him who was to receive (de Wette), nor to that of those who were to be received.

Ver. 6. **But whoso shall give offence.**—Whoso shall give him occasion for relapsing into unbelief, as was done by hierarchical arrogance. This was the offence with which the Church was at that moment threatened. There the hearts of the fathers were turned from their children, giving occasion for the hearts of the children turning from the fathers (*see* Mal. iv. 6, the concluding utterance of the Old Testament, and Luke i. 17). These later generations were led into unbelief by the hierarchical pretensions of the fathers, with their traditions.

One of these little ones (a single one).—Those of whom this child was a type. As formerly, the little ones being the beginners in the faith, or occupying a lower place in the Church; hence those who were naturally or spiritually little. But evidently those who had become little, in the sense of being thoroughly humbled, are not so easily shaken in their faith by hierarchical pretensions.

It were better for him, or literally: **it profiteth him for this** (συμφέρει αὐτῷ ἵνα) **that a millstone were hanged,** etc.—Meyer deems it imperative to take the ἵνα, in the expression συμφέρει ἵνα, in the proper sense: He explains, though not very clearly, that the text implies that his conduct would subserve *that special purpose*. Following the trace here indicated, we infer that the offence given arose from a desire after spiritual domination. This motive, then, of his offence (domination over the conscience) is *ironically* characterized in the text as *profiting him* (badly), for the purpose of having a millstone hanged, etc. We may illustrate this by quoting an analogous saying of Luther, addressed to the Elector John: "A forced Christian is a very pleasant and agreeable guest in the kingdom of heaven, in whom God takes special delight, and whom He will certainly set highest up among the angels—in *the deepest bottom of hell*." Of course, the statement applies much more fully to hierarchical pretensions. His arrogance and his domination profiteth him—yes, for this purpose, that a millstone shall be hanged, etc.—We are now prepared to understand the symbolical expressions, **millstone** and **sea.** From other passages we learn that hierarchism is destined to perish in the angry waves of the *sea* of nations, or in the midst of revolutions (Matt. vii. 6; Rev. xiii. 1, etc.). The expression *millstone* is, in the first instance, intended to designate a very large stone (Rev. xviii. 21), more especially the large upper millstone which was driven round by asses.* However, the term is not merely intended to refer to the weight of the stone, but also to the object which it serves in the mill. The latter is a figure of life, in its means of support (Matt. xxiv. 41; Rev. xviii. 22), while the millstone refers to the motive power. But the possessions of the temple were the load by which a corrupt hierarchy was ultimately drawn into the depths of the sea of perdition (James v. 1). To the Jews generally, the temple became in the end a millstone hung round their neck, which drew them into the depth of the sea of nations.

* [Hence de Wette and Meyer translate μύλος ὀνικός literally: *Eselsmühlstein*, in distinction from the smaller *hand-millstones*.—P. S.]

But this was not the end of offences. The καταποντισμός "was a mode of punishment common among the Greeks, Romans, Syrians, and Phœnicians, but not among the Jews. Hence it may be regarded as a dramatic and strong expression of the idea: he shall be deprived of life." (Meyer.) But even this heathen form of punishment deserves notice. The Jewish hierarchy was to be swept away by heathens.

Ver. 7. **Woe unto the world because of offences.**—The world as such does not *give*, but *receive* offences from false disciples; and that in what may be designated its border land, where it is represented by the little ones. The offence of these little ones would accumulate to such an amount as to bring a woe upon the whole world (comp. Matt. xxiii. 15; Rev. xvii. 5).

For it must needs be.—Not referring to fate, or to a metaphysical, but to a historical ἀνάγκη, or the necessary connection between guilt and judgment; and in this sense not merely allowed by God, but "ultimately traceable to the divine counsel." (Meyer.)

But woe to the man by whom the offence cometh.—*The offence* (τὸ σκάνδαλον) is the guilt of an individual, giving rise *to offences* (τὰ σκάνδαλα), which themselves are sent by way of judgment. And if woe descends on the world on account of these offences, how much more does it hold true of the man who is the cause or the occasion of them! Instances of individuals who gave such offences will readily occur to the reader; as, for example, Judas, Caiaphas, etc. (On the other aspect of historical necessity, comp. the word of Paul, 1 Cor. xi. 19.)

Ver. 8. **Wherefore, if thy hand or thy foot offend thee.**—Comp. ch. v. 29. De Wette and others regard this as a mere repetition not suitable in this connection, as referring to seduction by our own senses and not by the instrumentality of others. But it should be noted, that in the former passage the expression is used in connection with marriage offences; and here, in regard to ecclesiastical offences,—the link of connection being the mystical idea of marriage. Hence it means, If thine hand, or thy foot, or thine eye, threaten to sever the union between thy heart and Christ. The ministers of Christ are themselves offended by their hand, their foot, or their eye, before they become an offence to others. The text aptly adds, *the foot*, to the other emblems mentioned in ch. v. 29, which in this connection have a different meaning from the earlier passage. The hand here designates special aptitude and inclination for ecclesiastical *government;* the foot, for ecclesiastical *exertion* and *missionary undertakings;* the eye, for ecclesiastical *perception* and *knowledge*. All these gifts should remain in subjection to the Spirit of Christ, and serve for the advancement and edification of the little ones, instead of inducing pride or contempt of inferiors.

It will look fairer, καλόν σοί ἐστιν **(it is better for thee).**—The Hebrews combined the two ideas of goodness and beauty under the term *good*, while the Greeks comprehended them under that of *fair*. Both views may equally be expressed in Christian language. In the present instance, the idea of beauty is brought prominently forward, with special reference to the maiming caused by moral necessity. Philologically we note, that the positive degree καλόν is here combined with the comparative ἤ, on account of the attractive combination of the two constructions. (Comp. Meyer.)

Halt.—The loss of one foot causes the other to halt. The expression "*maimed*," refers more particularly to the arms.

Ver. 10. **Take heed.**—Our Lord again addresses Himself to the disciples, who were not to give offence. He mentions the *cause* of such offence as consisting in *contempt*, more especially of *these little ones*. Accordingly, He now points out the high value which God sets upon them.

Their angels in heaven do always behold.—De Wette: "In the Old Testament we only read of guardian angels of empires (Dan. x. 13, 20). But at a later period the Jews believed also in the existence of guardian angels for individuals (Targ. Jonathan; Gen. xxxiii. 10; xxxv. 10; xlviii. 16. Eisenmenger, *Neuentdecktes Judenthum*, i. 389). Similarly also the New Testament (Acts xii. 7?) The expression, that the guardian angels of these children always behold the face of God, or are near unto Him (as the servants of a king, 2 Kings xxv. 19), implies, that God specially cares for them. But as Jesus cannot ascribe any partiality to God, even for innocent children, the whole statement must be regarded as a figurative expression, indicating the high value attaching to these children, and the importance of their spiritual welfare." Meyer, in opposition to de Wette, justly remarks: "The belief in guardian angels is here clearly admitted by Christ. Critics should simply acknowledge the fact, without adopting the idea that it applies to patron saints enjoying peculiar bliss in heaven." Grotius takes the Roman Catholic view of this passage, which of course most Protestant divines controvert. Grotius appeals to Origen (*Homil.* viii. *in Genesin*), to Tertullian (*de Baptismo*), and to Clement, who speaks of the protecting demon in which the Platonists believed. Still, Clement does not maintain in so many words that every one had his patron angel. Origen, and after him Gregory of Nyssa, held that every person was accompanied both by a good and by an evil angel. The view of Grotius is somewhat different. He believes in the general guardianship of angels, rather than in the attendance of individual messengers of mercy. Olshausen applies the passage to the preexistent ideal of men. But it deserves notice, that while Jesus evidently admits the doctrine concerning guardian angels, which had been fully developed during the period of the Apocrypha, He lays special emphasis not so much on that subject, as on the fact, that the angels of these little ones *always* behold the face of God. Not only are they highly placed, but they do not seem to be actively employed—as if God were through them always Himself looking upon these little ones. There is a *most special* Providence watching over the little ones, of which the angels are the medium, and in which the angelic life of these children is combined with the highest guardianship in heaven and on earth. The fundamental idea is, that the highest angels of God in heaven represent the smallest subjects of His kingdom on earth, Ps. cxiii. 5, 6. The eye of God rests in special protection on the young seed in His kingdom (Matt. xix.). But as Christ is the Angel of His presence in a unique sense, while here we read of angels of the presence in the plural (the idea being formed after the analogy of the ministers of eastern kings, 2 Kings xxv. 19, comp. with 1 Kings x. 8), it follows, that Christ Himself, as the great Advocate and Intercessor, is Himself the central-point of this angelic guardianship.

Ver. 11. **That which is lost.**—A strong general expression, designating *those* who are lost. Meyer: those who had incurred eternal damnation. But the succeeding parable shows that our Lord rather refers to those who had strayed and were in misery. The conduct of Christ forms a direct contrast to that of the men giving offence. He came to save that which was lost; while they, in their pride, repelled those who had lately given hope of escaping from their lost state. Hence also, as the Angel of the presence, and as Saviour of the lost, Christ Himself is surety to us that these little ones are represented in the presence of His Father by Himself and His associates.

[STIER: "Here is Jacob's ladder planted before our eyes: beneath are the little ones [the children of age and of grace];—then their angels;—then the Son of Man in heaven, in whom alone man is exalted above the angels, who, as the great Angel of the Covenant, cometh from the presence and bosom of the Father to save those that were lost; and above Him again (ver. 14) the Father Himself, and His good pleasure."—P. S.]

Ver. 12. **What think ye?**—In ch. xv. 4, this parable is again introduced in a different context. But we readily trace an internal connection between these two occasions, both in reference to the circumstances in which they were uttered, and to the state of feeling prevailing at the time. The difference, that in the one case the ninety-nine sheep are represented as left in the *mountains*, and in the other in the *wilderness*, is unimportant. Of greater moment is the fact, that in the Gospel of Matthew the parable is addressed to the Pharisees, who themselves represent the ninety-nine sheep, while in the Gospel of Luke it is spoken to the New Testament shepherds, who, after the example of the Master, were to take special charge of the lost.

Ver. 14. **Even so it is not the will of your Father.**—He has no fixed purpose that one of these little ones perish. We regard this as a decisive statement against the doctrine of actual predestination to *condemnation*. This negation implies, in the first instance, a denial of all those assumptions according to which hierarchical minds attempt judicially to fix the state of souls. For this they have no authority whatever in the gospel; on the contrary, their human traditions are in direct opposition to the will of God. The statement of Christ, also, evidently implies an affirmation, that God willeth that all should be saved (1 Tim. ii. 4). He would secure for Himself the full number of His flock; and hence calleth sinners, and more particularly the lost. On this very ground, then, His great care is on behalf of that which is lost; His is saving grace. To such an extent is His administration directed by grace, that, in view of it, one lost sheep may exceed in importance ninety-nine who are not lost. These ninety-nine sheep either feed themselves (according to the passage in the text), or else deem themselves independent of special help (according to the passage in Luke). At all events, the case is quite different with the lost sheep, whether the idea of "lost" be taken in the objective, as in the text, or in the subjective sense, as in Luke. To all such the blessed decree of grace applies, and for such the Son and the Spirit are waiting.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. It scarcely requires any argument to show that this statement of the Lord concerning the little child affords no evidence against the doctrine of original

sin. When Jesus called Peter blessed, He referred to his faith as Peter, not to his individuality as Simon. Similarly, when setting the child in the midst, it is its childlikeness, and not the mere fact of its youth, far less that of its innocence, which is intended as an emblem and model. Children are here a symbol of humility, just as natural birth is a symbol of regeneration. Hence we also infer that the Lord here alluded to the natural humility of the child, to its dependence, need of affection, and consequent want of pretension, as well as to its enjoyment of the passing moment.

2. *Who is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven?*—Who has the primacy? It might almost seem as if the disciples were relapsing into their old Jewish views of a carnal kingdom, with political offices, ranks, and dignities attaching to it. But this was not the case. They knew that their ἐκκλησία was destined to form a contrast to the ancient theocracy, and to the kingdoms of this world. Still, they had as yet no adequate conception of a spiritual order of things, and accordingly transferred to the Church their political and hierarchical associations. If a Church was to be founded, a hierarchy must, in their opinion, be instituted along with it. This idea seems to have been further confirmed in their minds after the transaction about the tribute-money, in which they seem to have noted rather the distinction conferred on Peter, than the humiliation which he had experienced.

3. As the inquiry of the disciples bore so distinctly upon the establishment of a hierarchy, the symbolical action of the Master, in placing a child in the midst of them, formed the most complete refutation of their theory. Still, this transaction does not in the least invalidate the institution of the apostolical and ecclesiastical office (ch. xvi.). Hence the passage must be regarded as only more clearly defining the ecclesiastical office, as a ministry of love (a ministerial office for the *sacerdotium* of the whole congregation, according to the principles of the gospel),—a ministry of humility, in opposition to hierarchical claims; of condescension to little ones, in opposition to that of ascending grades; and of pastoral watchfulness, in opposition to hierarchical pride and domination, which is here characterized and condemned both as the grand offence of New Testament times, and as the greatest temptation and corruption of the Christian world. From this explanation of the Lord, we are enabled to gather the great outlines of New Testament Church order: 1. Its leading principles (in our section); again, 2. the rules of Christian discipline; 3. those of Christian and ecclesiastical absolution. The leading principles are as follows:

a. First principle: *Except ye be converted.*—Conversion is the primary condition, not only of being leaders in the kingdom of heaven, but even of being members of it. This conversion must be more particularly characterized by a childlike want of pretension,—*i. e.*, by spiritual humility, which may be described as repentance in a permanent form. Hence the imperious hierarch excludes himself, both by his spirit and by his conduct, not only from office, but even from the kingdom of heaven itself. He ceases not merely to be a servant of Christ, but even a Christian. All such desires after primacy must be removed by conversion and regeneration. Luther: "Who has ever seen an animal living after its head was dead?"

b. Second principle: *Whosoever therefore shall humble himself.*—Rank or dignity in the kingdom of heaven is to be proportionate to humility and to the ministry of love. In other words, real condescension (not merely by such *phrases* as the papal *servus servorum*) is to be the measure of our real exaltation. The general basis underlying all is, that all are equal and one in Christ. The desires after primacy are to give place to an opposite desire after fraternal service of love.

c. Third principle: *Whoso shall receive one such little child.*—Christ would have us recognize and receive Himself in these little ones, or in beginners in the faith. Our evangelical ministry is to be characterized by respect and veneration for the life that is of God, or for Christ in His little ones. Thus the pastoral office is to combine the qualities of freedom on the one, and of love on the other, hand; while it is at the same time made the means of training the young and the weak in faith to the manhood and full stature in Christ.

Thus there are three degrees of evangelical primacy—humble faith, condescension to the little ones, and the training and elevating them—in opposition to the three stages of hierarchical primacy. The latter are—1. Progressive symbolical conversion to hierarchism; 2. hierarchical gradations; 3. contempt of the congregation of the little ones. Accordingly, the triple crown of the true minister of Christ consists in conversion and humility, fraternal service of love, and veneration for the priestly character of the congregation (Christ in the little ones).

4. *But whoso shall offend.*—We have now a delineation of the opposite conduct.

a. From the context we gather that the passage applies exclusively to offences arising from hierarchical pride, self-exaltation and contempt of these little ones. The Lord first refers to the sin, and then to the punishment.

b. Jesus announces that great danger and corruption would accrue to the world from these offences. Woe unto the world because of offences!

c. The Lord shows how His servants may come to give offence to others, having been first tempted and seduced themselves (being offended by their hand, their foot, or their eye). From the context we gather that in this connection the term *hand* refers to ecclesiastical despotism (Matt. xxiii. 13, 14), *foot* to activity in proselytizing (Matt. xxiii. 15), and *eye* to pride of knowledge which would seek to exalt patristic, gnostic, theosophic, or mystical lore and fellowship above the Church, Rom. xii. 3. The Apostle John, who was the occasion of this saying, himself afforded a signal instance of the manner in which a right hand was to be cut off (*see* the author's *Leben Jesu*, ii. 2, p. 1021). Stier (iii. 26) seems to overlook the necessity of John's special training for the high place which he was to occupy in the kingdom of God.

d. The source of these offences: contempt of the little ones. This is to give place to a proper acknowledgment of their character, of their mysterious proximity to God, of their calling and object in the kingdom of heaven, and of their glorious and blessed representatives and guardians, viz., the angels and Christ Himself.

5. Both the above antitheses are now explained and illustrated by the fundamental idea and characteristic feature of the kingdom of heaven, which is compassion. *For the Son of Man is come to save that which was lost.* Christ primarily came to seek that which was lost, and not merely the little ones. In this economy of sovereign pity, where the Saviour

descends to the lowest depth of misery, there to display in all its fulness His character as Redeemer, it is impossible that His subordinate servants should enter upon an opposite course. The watchfulness of the faithful shepherd in the mountains serves as an emblem of the faithfulness of our heavenly Shepherd. But the root and spring of their life must ultimately be traced to the gracious purpose of our Father in heaven, who willeth not that one of these little ones perish.

6. The fact, that in Matt. xviii. the disciples are introduced as asking the Lord who was the greatest in the kingdom of heaven, incontestably proves that He could not have meant His statement in Matt. xvi. to imply that Peter was to enjoy any primacy in the Church.

7. We may here remark, that for educational purposes it is well, wisely to set before children the two great dangers—of excessive childishness, on the one hand, and, on the other, of an unchildlike spirit.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The Lord Himself must settle the question about primacy.—Primacy in the kingdom of heaven belongs to obscure children.—The solemn declaration of the Lord against any human primacy in His Church.—Let us take the little ones, and not the great of this world, as our model for the offices and dignities in the Church.—The little child a warning lesson set before the Apostles.—How the Lord has made children a perpetual and living condemnation of spiritual and ecclesiastical pretensions.—The child a twofold emblem: 1. A model to those who deem themselves great, how they are to become little, and thereby really great; 2. a symbol of those who are little in a spiritual sense, and who are not to be offended by spiritual domination.—Personal regeneration the condition of ecclesiastical greatness.—It is altogether vain to contend for a position in the kingdom of God, if there is any question as to our having entered into it.—"Except ye be converted;" or, aims after worldly greatness in the Church, are in reality aims after going beyond its pale.—A perversion of the office of minister into ruler, as raising the question of the genuineness of our first conversion.—In what respect may children serve as models to the ministers of Christ?—To Christians generally?—Self-abasement the only road to exaltation in the kingdom of heaven.—How the little ones grow, just because they are little.—How the want of pretension in children secures their enjoyment of life and their pre-eminence.—The threefold sermon of the Lord on the subject of the little ones: 1. Become as little children, in order to become Christians; 2. Receive these little children for Christ's sake; 3. Offend not these little children, who enjoy the guardianship of the angels and of the Father who is in heaven.—Whoso shall receive one such little child.—Only he who can feed the lambs can feed the sheep; *see* John xx. 15.—Honorable distinction of the office of teacher.—Sacredness of the catechetical office.—Solemn judgment resting on those who give offence to the little ones.—To what offences did the Lord specially refer in the text?—Offences are unavoidable, yet their authors are chargeable with them.—If we are to avoid giving offence to the members of Christ, let us beware of taking offence in our own members.—How a Christian may become an offence in the Church: 1. By the domination of his hand; 2. by the spurious proselytizing zeal of his foot; 3. by the fanatical and distorted perceptions of his eye.—How a Christian is to make sure of his fellowship with the Church, even at the cost of the most painful sacrifices, Rom. xii. 3; in the same manner also to secure his own salvation.—The abuse of God's gifts for selfish purposes will ensure our ruin.—Christ condescending to seek that which was lost a model to His servants.—How the ways of the Lord, and of those who would assume the mastery in the Church, are opposed: 1. Christ descended, and then ascended; 2. they ascend, and then descend, as if a millstone were hanged round their necks, and they drawn into the depths of the sea.—The ministry of the gospel not priestly domination, but pastoral service.—The faithfulness of earthly shepherds a symbol of that of the Great Shepherd.—Why the Shepherd cherishes so much the lost sheep: 1. Because it is a lost life, and not a dead possession; 2. because He is a faithful Shepherd, full of compassion, not one who reckons closely.—One lost sheep may be of greater importance to the Good Shepherd than ninety and nine who have not gone astray; or, the infinite glory of the kingdom of grace.—"It is not the will of your Father," etc. Lessons to be derived from this by the Church: 1. In respect of doctrine; 2. in respect of rule; 3. in respect of the mission of the Church.—The threefold will: to save that which was lost. The will, 1. in heaven above; 2. on Golgotha; 3. in the heart of the Church.

Starke:—*Hedinger*: What a shame that the disciples of Christ should be engrossed with pride and ambition, when their Head has become their servant, and for their sake humbled Himself even unto death!—*Zeisius*: It is the wicked way of man that each one seeks to become high, not lowly—to rule, not to serve.—It is not said, Become little children, but, Become *as* little children.—*Langii opus bibl.*: The innocence of children appears especially in their simplicity, humility, love, kindliness, and obedience, viewing these qualities alone, and irrespective of their faults.—*Zeisius*: He who is lowest in his own eyes, and in those of the world, is greatest before God.—Think not how you may become great, but rather how ye may be made small.—What a blessed work, and what glorious reward, to become the patron and friend of children, of orphans, and of the weak!—*Canstein*: To build orphanages is a great work.—What precious treasure have parents in their children, since for their sakes the holy angels and Christ Himself lodge with them! *Bibl. Wurt.*—*Quesnel*: If to offend one soul is to incur the wrath of God, how awful must be the judgment of those who offend a whole town or country!—Offences are the source of fearful evil to the world; but they are made to work together for good to them that love God.

Lisco:—The main point consists in that sense of weakness and dependence which is characteristic of children.

Gerlach:—On account of their weakness, children require the special protection of angels; but they are so precious in the sight of God, that He selects for that purpose His most exalted messengers.

Heubner:—The human heart is naturally inclined to self-exaltation, and both ambition and pride find their way even into the kingdom of Christ.—How Christ answered the inquiry, what constituted true and what spurious greatness.—Each one of us requires a thorough conversion of the heart.—A child-

like spirit, the basis of true religion.—A childlike spirit: humility, guilelessness, forgetfulness of self, teachableness, faith.—*Goltz* (from Spangenberg and Luther): The child the living symbol of the destiny of man.—The more willing thou art to become a child, the more fully wilt thou experience that God is thy Father.—The time will come when God will acknowledge quiet, humble, and retiring souls.—Those who seduce simple and unsuspecting minds incur the heaviest guilt.—The world the scene of offences.—Every other evil is as nothing compared with the number of seductions in the world.—Children and childlike persons the special favorites of Heaven.—To train children is to give joy to the angels.—*Brentius, Præfatio catechismi: In medio puerorum versari est esse in medio angelorum.*—On the whole section:—The conversion to childlikeness of spirit which the Lord here requires: 1. Its character; 2. its importance.—How Christ, the Friend of children, recommends children to our care.—Christ is that faithful Shepherd who has left His thousands on the heavenly mountains (the angelic hosts, as Cyril of Jerusalem has it, Cat. xv.) to come down and seek the lost sheep of humanity.—*Rieger* (*Five Sermons*, Leipzig, 1766): The gracious care of our Father in heaven and of Christ even for a single soul.

Bachmann:—The high value attaching to children in the kingdom of God.

B. *The Discipline of the Church.* CH. XVIII. 15–20.

15 Moreover [But] if thy brother shall trespass [sin, ἁμαρτήσῃ][1] against thee,[2] go and
tell him his fault between thee and him alone: if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained
16 thy brother. But if he will not hear *thee, then* take with thee one or two more, that in
17 the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established [σταθῇ]. And if
he shall neglect to hear them, tell *it* unto the church:[3] but if he neglect to hear the
church [also, καί], let him be unto thee as a heathen man [heathen] and a publican.
18 Verily I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven;
19 and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven. Again [verily][4] I
say unto you, That if [only] two of you shall agree[5] on earth as touching anything
that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which [who] is in heaven.
20 For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of
them.

[1] Ver. 15.—[Compare ver. 21, where the E. V. renders ἁμαρτάνειν: *sin*.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 15.—Lachmann and Tischendorf [*not* in his large critical edition of 1859], after Cod. B., al., omit εἰς σέ (*against thee*). The omission made the sense clearer; but for this very reason the words should be retained.

[3] Ver. 17.—[Here ἐκκλησία is used in the sense of a *particular* or *local* congregation, as often in the Epistles, while in xvi. 18 it means the church *universal*, since no individual congregation (or denomination) has the promise of indestructible life. Comp. on ἐκκλησία, and its proper translation, the *Crit. Note* No. 4 on p. 298.—P. S.]

[4] Ver. 19.—The reading πάλιν ἀμήν [instead of πάλιν without ἀμήν] is very strongly attested [and adopted by Tischendorf and Alford. Lachmann reads ἀμήν without πάλιν, and gives Cod. B. as his authority. But this is an error; the Vatican Codex, both in the edition of Angelo Mai and that of Phil. Buttmann jun., reads πάλιν ἀμήν.—P. S.]

[5] Ver. 19.—The future συμφωνήσουσιν is best attested. [Adopted by Tischendorf and Alford. Sustained by Cod. Sinait. which reads: ἐὰν δύο συμφωνήσουσιν ἐξ ὑμῶν. Lachmann reads with Cod. Vaticanus and *text. rec.* the subjunctive συμφωνήσωσιν, which looks like a grammatical emendation. Meyer (1858) and Tischendorf (1859) quote Cod. B. in favor of the future, but both the editions of this Codex by Angelo Mai (Rome, 1857, and sec. ed., 1859) and that of Phil. Buttmann (Berlin, 1862) read the subjunctive, as stated previously by Birch and Lachmann. The ω or ου seems to be very indistinctly written in the original MS., so as to account for the difference among the collators and editors. Comp. the note in Buttmann's edition of Cod. Vat., p. 501, sub Matt. xviii. 19.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Logical Connection.—Meyer denies the existence of such a connection with the preceding context, and objects to the construction of Beza: "*Ubi de iis disseruit, qui sunt aliis offendiculo, nunc quid sit iis faciendum declarat, quibus objectum est offendiculum.*" The connection lies in the condemnation of hierarchical practices. Hence the view of Beza is substantially correct. Give no offence to your neighbor, but rather overcome by love the offence which he gives to you. Or, in the special form in which it is expressed in the text, Put no stumbling-block in the way of your neighbor by hierarchical offences, but rather assist the Church in removing such offences.

Ver. 15. **Against thee.**—Not merely referring to personal offences, but rather to sins, which, being done in presence of others, cannot but excite attention and give offence. Viewed in the context, it might be paraphrased: Sin not against thy brother by giving him offence. Again, on the other hand, overcome by the discipline of love the offence which he has given thee.

Between thee and him alone.—First measure. Brotherly admonition, or private entreaty. Meyer: "The administration of reproof is here represented as intervening between the two parties." But this critic is mistaken in supposing that the text refers to party disputes. Of course, the expression implies that the guilt rests with our brother.

Thou hast gained thy brother.—Euthym. Zigab.: In respect of brotherly fellowship. Meyer,

more correctly: For the kingdom of the Messiah. Both ideas, however, seem combined in the text. The person who has been gained for the kingdom of the Messiah becomes the brother of him who has thus gained him. He has been *gained* by wisdom and cautious dealing, when serious loss seemed impending. Such private expostulation implies self-denial and courage, while it gives our brother the impression that we feel for him, that we love him, and would willingly spare him. Such an assault of love upon his heart may gain him. The opposite course, of hastily divulging his fault, is an evidence of pride, harshness, cowardice, want of love and of prudence. In all probability, it will only tend to embitter, and thus further to alienate our brother. Besides, in our personal dealings as individuals, we are not entitled to go beyond this private expostulation, unless we know that we act in the spirit of the whole Church (Acts v.; 1 Cor. v.).

Ver. 16. **One or two more.**—This is the second measure to be adopted. One or two witnesses are now to be called in. The law of Moses enjoined the judicial examination of witnesses (Deut. xix. 15). In this instance, the final judgment of God is supposed to be already commencing, and witnesses are called in, because the guilty brother is to become his own judge.

The question has been asked, whether the word σταθῇ here means, "*be established*," or else, "*stand still, rest, depend.*" The latter meaning seems to be preferable, as the guilt of the offending brother is apparently admitted. The fault of our brother is not to be prematurely published. Hence, while in the first clause of the verse we read, "Take with thee one or two," the last clause speaks of two or three witnesses. If our brother confesses his fault, he becomes himself the third witness, and there are no longer merely two, but three who know of the fault.

Ver. 17. **To the church (congregation).**—Third measure. From ch. xvi. 18, the term ἐκκλησία must always be understood as referring to the *Christian* Church, or to the meeting of believers, whether it be large or small. Calvin, Beza, and others mistake equally the meaning and the connection of the passage in applying it to the Jewish synagogue. In opposition to this, de Wette remarks, 1. That the term ἐκκλησία is never applied to the synagogue; 2. that Jesus could not have meant to direct His disciples to apply to a community which was estranged from them in spirit, for the purpose of restoring brotherly relations among themselves; 3. that vers. 18–20 evidently refer to Christian fellowship, and to its power and quickening by His presence. But when de Wette suggests that both this passage and ch. xvi. 18 were a historical prolepsis, he must have wholly missed the connection of the gospel history in the mind of Matthew. Similarly, Roman Catholic interpreters are entirely in error in explaining the passage: Tell it to the *bishops*. Even de Wette and Vitringa go beyond the text, in supposing that it applies to the function of the rulers of the Church as arbitrators or judges on moral questions. On the contrary, the ἐκκλησία is in this passage put in antithesis to the question touching the μείζων ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν. Hence this would have been the most unsuitable place for anything like the sanction of a hierarchy. It is indeed true that the Church is, in the first place, approached and addressed through its officials. But then we must also bear in mind, that there is an entire accordance between the views and dealings of these officials and those of the Church, and not anything like hierarchical assumption on their part (comp. 1 Cor. v. 4). [ALFORD: "That ἐκκλησία cannot mean the *Church as represented by her rulers*, appears by (from) vers. 19, 20,—where *any* collection of believers is gifted with the power of deciding in such cases. Nothing could be further from the spirit of our Lord's command than proceedings in what were oddly enough called 'ecclesiastical courts.'"—P. S.]

Let him be unto thee.—The Jews regarded heathens and publicans as excommunicated persons. As such we are to consider a Christian who perseveres in his offence: he is no longer to be acknowledged as belonging to the fellowship of saints. The accord of the Church in this step is implied. Still the verse reads, Let him be to *thee*—not, *to the church;* the personal impulse being in this case a prophetic manifestation of the gift of discerning the spirits. Viewing it in this light, we cannot imagine how Meyer could infer that it did not apply to excommunication—all the more so, that he himself refers it to the cessation of *all* fellowship with such a person. However, we question the correctness of the latter statement. In our opinion, the text only implies the cessation of *ecclesiastical* fellowship, not of civil or social intercourse. In point of fact, it was the mistake of the Jews to convert what was intended as an ecclesiastical censure into a civil punishment. Perhaps this might be excusable under the ancient theocracy, when State and Church were not yet distinct. Nay, when the theocracy was first founded, it was even necessary under certain conditions, and for a season (*see* the laws against the Canaanites). But under the New Testament dispensation this confusion of civil and sacred matters has entirely ceased. Christ did not regard the publicans and heathens, viewed as such, as belonging to His communion; but He considered them the objects of His mission. Accordingly, we must take the idea of excommunication in this light. The Roman Catholic Church has, on the question of discipline, again lapsed into Judaism. Regarding those who are excommunicated as heretics, if not as heathens and publicans, it hands them over to the civil tribunals.

Ver. 18. **Verily I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth.**—It is very remarkable that Christ should have employed a solemn adjuration, when according the power of the keys to all His disciples, and with them to the Church generally, or rather to the Church along with the disciples. For, evidently, while ver. 17 lays down the rule for the conduct of the Church, ver. 18 shows that the Church is warranted in this conduct. This right is again solemnly confirmed by the *amen* in ver. 19. The similarity of expression with ch. xvi. 19 shows that this passage also refers to the office of the keys; and hence that both vers. 17 and 18 referred to its exercise. The privilege therefore of Peter only consisted in this, that he was the first to make confession and to bear witness (*see* Acts v., viii., xi.), in accordance with the Church generally, to which he also was subject. But whenever he occupied a separate position, he also subjected himself to the discipline and reproof of the Church (Gal. ii. 11).

Ver. 19. **Again, verily I say unto you.**—The reading πάλιν ἀμήν is very fully attested. This *amen* was afterward omitted from the text, probably from an apprehension that it might be quoted in support of separatism.—**That if** [only] **two of you shall agree.**—The smallest number which could form a

fellowship. They shall agree on earth, *i. e.*, in forming a social and visible fellowship. This, however, does not imply that two believers will always suffice to form a church. The emphasis rests on the word *συμφωνία*. Such a full agreement of two persons could only be wrought by the Holy Spirit. Hence it represents in principle the catholicity of the whole Church. The smallest fragment of a straight line may be closely and homogeneously joined to all similar fragments. Suffice it, that the Church may commence, continue and be reformed with two individuals. The prayer of these two humble individuals on earth brings down the gracious answer of the Father who is in heaven, thereby attesting and confirming the character of the Church.

Ver. 20. **For where two or three are gathered together.**—A confirmation and explanation of what had preceded. The two individuals must not stand aloof in a sectarian spirit, but seek to become three. Similarly, their *συμφωνία* must consist in being gathered together *in the name of Jesus*. If such be the case, Himself is in the midst of them by His Spirit. It is this presence of the Shechinah, in the real sense of the term, which forms and constitutes His *ἐκκλησία*, or *Kahal*. Hence it also enjoys both the blessings and the protection of our Father who is in heaven. Lightfoot: "*Simile dicunt Rabbini de duobus aut tribus considentibus in judicio, quod Schechina sit in medio eorum.*"

The statement in ver. 19 must evidently be regarded as primarily a continuation of the second measure prescribed in cases of offence, when two or three witnesses were to be called in. It is as if the Lord hoped that, by their earnest continuance in prayer, these witnesses would prevent the necessity of extreme measures. But if they should be obliged to assemble in His name in order to lay a formal accusation before the Church, the Lord promised to be in the midst of them. The fact that the phraseology of the text so closely resembles that of ver. 16, seems to imply, in a certain sense, an antithesis. Probably the meaning is: The two or three who form a true Church shall not be entirely dependent upon the large majority of a larger *ἐκκλησία*, nor upon the possible abuse of the power of the keys. Their outward minority is compensated by the blessing of the Father, and by the presence of Christ, or by an inward and real excess of power. Thus the Lord points to the circumstance, that the essential characteristics and the power of the Church lie not in the existence of an outward majority, or in the presence of great masses of people. Christ intervenes between the first and the third measure of discipline.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. According to the direction of the Lord in the passage under consideration, ecclesiastical discipline should above all things rest on the basis of brotherly faithfulness in the private intercourse of Christians. This is the first condition for the proper exercise of Church discipline.

2. According to apostolic direction, excommunication was only to take place if the person who gave offence obstinately resisted the Church itself. In that case, both truth and honor required that such bold and open opposition, either to the principles, doctrines, or practice of the Church, should not be tolerated in the midst of it. More than this; esteem, love, and faithfulness toward the offending brother himself demanded such a step. Still, such an one was only to be ranked with that class from which he had at first been taken, and from which the Church is ever willing to receive proselytes, and hence also to welcome penitents. All this implies that the excommunicated person was not to be subjected to civil pains and penalties by the Church.—"*Let him be unto thee as a heathen and a publican.*" These words convey a very different meaning to Christians from what they did to the Jews. The latter despised and condemned heathens and publicans; Christ received them. In other words, where the *discipline* of the Church ceases, its *missionary* work commences anew. Perhaps we might rather call it the *catechetical* office—as the penitent professes a desire to have the bond which had been broken restored, and hence does not require to be again admitted by a new baptism, but only to be restored to the fellowship of the Church.

3. The characteristic of true catholicity is not outward uniformity, but inward unity in the Spirit of Christ. Therefore, when even two are completely united, they are, in point of fact, in fellowship with all the holy spirits both in heaven and on earth, and Christ Himself is in the midst of them.

4. Not "*three or two*," but "*two or three.*" The pure Church may for a time be very small, but it must always aim after universality. Besides, it deserves notice that this saying of the Lord was closely connected with His teaching about primacy in the Church, and about offences; hence we may see with what tender care He watched over the interests and how He defended the origin of the evangelical Church.

5. On the subject of Jewish excommunication, comp. Winer's *Real-Wörterbuch*, *sub Bann*, and on Christian excommunication, Herzog's *Real-Encyclop.*, *sub Bann*. The *lesser* excommunication implied only the cessation of full and *purely* ecclesiastical fellowship. The person excluded became, for the time, a non-communicant. A deep meaning attached to the practice of the ancient Church, by which such an individual was in certain respects ranked among the general hearers of the word and the catechumens. In truth, his connection with the Church had not wholly ceased; it may be regarded rather as suspended for a time, than as completely terminated. Hence the *greater* excommunication may be said to be no longer applicable to any individuals, as it necessarily involved civil consequences. At first sight, some of the statements of Paul seem to imply such a procedure; but a further examination of the passages in question will modify our ideas on that point. Thus, 1 Cor. v. 11 refers probably to the common meal of brotherly fellowship; while the formulas in 1 Cor. xvi. 22, and Gal. i. 8, 9, appear to us to be couched in hypothetical language, as a thing that might and should take place in certain circumstances, not as one that had actually occurred. Of recent writers on the subject, we mention Meyer of Rostock, Otto (Bonn, 1856), M. Göbel, *On Eccl. Discipline in the Reformed Church until Calvin* (*Kirchl. Vierteljahr's Schrift*, ii. Jahrg., Berlin, 1845). Also the Transactions of the German Church Diet for 1856.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The necessity of ecclesiastical discipline. 1. The gospel cannot be preserved without salt; nor, 2. fra-

ternal love without frankness: nor, 3. a particular church without discipline; nor, 4. the Church in general without the spirit of discipline.—The object of all Christian and ecclesiastical reproof is to gain our brother.—The frankness of affectionate, brotherly faithfulness, the basis of ecclesiastical discipline.—The exercise of ecclesiastical discipline implying the institution and the establishment of a Christian Church; but, on the other hand, churches must be trained and educated to this duty.—The training of the Church for the exercise of Christian discipline forms the commencement of that discipline.—How the discipline of the Church is to prove affectionate care for the spiritual welfare of our brother: 1. Its object is to exclude sin from the Church, but to retain our brother; 2. its mode of exercise—frankness, decision, wisdom, prudence.—How genuine Church discipline observes the principle of progressing from private to open dealings.—The object of Christian reproof being to awaken, not to harden, we must display—1. Compassion, to the extent of even appearing to share the guilt; 2. compassion, to the extent of even appearing to cry for help; 3. compassion, to the extent of even appearing to be inexorable.—The three different kinds of Church discipline: 1. Our brother is excommunicated, but sin is retained in the Church; 2. sin is cast out along with our brother; 3. sin is eliminated, and our brother restored.—The right of reproof: The individual may exercise it privately, if he has strength and courage for it; a small number of friends may administer it in kindly intercourse; the Church may publicly exercise it, *i. e.*, not in opposition to the ministry, but as represented by it.—The exercise of discipline incumbent on the Church and its representatives.—To whom did Christ say, "Tell it to the Church?" 1. He said it to Peter; 2. to all the Apostles.—The Church called to take an active part in the administration of its most sacred affairs.—The power of the keys vested in the apostolic Church.—How fellowship of prayer leads to fellowship of faith.—*Agreement of the Spirit*, a confirmation of the power of the keys.—Evidence of this.—How the keys have lost their power when the spirits are not subject to Christ.—How the whole Church of Christ may revive in the smallest community.—The great Church appears in a small community: 1. If there be agreement in the spirit of prayer, securing the answer of the Father 2. if there be union in the name of Jesus, and hence the presence of Christ.—The characteristic features of the true Church: 1. An inward life of prayer; 2. an outward life of confession.—What is the state of a church if, 1. the former of these two characteristics is wanting; or, 2. the latter; or, 3. both are gone.—The great promises of Christ shall be fulfilled, even in the experience of the weakest church.—The watch word of the Church and the watchword of sectarianism. The former: *two or three;* the latter: *three or, two.*—How this promise of the Lord was fulfilled in the formation of the Protestant Churches.

Starke:—Zeisius: Secret sins should be secretly rebuked and expiated, but open sins, openly.—*Cramer:* It is very dangerous to be excluded from the communion of the saints.—*Hedinger*: The prayer of a righteous man availeth much, nay, everything; James v. 16.

Gerlach:—What in ch. xvi. 19 had (apparently) been bestowed upon Peter alone, is here conferred on the whole Christian Church, being ultimately traceable to the character of Christian communion as the outward manifestation of the invisible Church.—The Church of Christ on earth consists of a number of circles, drawn around the same centre, and always widening. Its well-being consists in this, that all have the proper centre, and that none of the circles interferes with the other.

Gossner:—The principal thing is the *agreement.*—All depends not on large numbers, but on the presence of Christ as the third or fourth in a spiritual communion.

Heubner:—We can only call those persons our own whom we have gained for the kingdom of heaven.—The decline of, and the difficulties attending upon, the exercise of scriptural discipline, constitute glaring evidence of the sad decay of our State Churches (or rather, of the hierarchical disinclination of office to train the congregation to spiritual self-government).*—Wherein may two be agreed? Manifestly, not in temporal things (or rather, in matters of pure egotism).

* A Prussian regulation of March 27, 1748, prohibits the minister from excluding any of their church members from the holy communion. Now cases of the kind must be reported to the royal consistories.

C. *Absolution in the Church.* CH. XVIII. 21-35.

(*Vers.* 23-35 *the Gospel for the* 22*d Sunday after Trinity.*)

21 Then came Peter to him, and said, Lord, how oft shall my brother sin against me,
22 and I forgive him? till [until, ἕως] seven times? Jesus saith unto him, I say not unto
thee, Until [ἕως] seven times: but, Until seventy times seven.
23 Therefore is the kingdom of heaven likened unto a certain king [a human king,
ἀνθρώπῳ βασιλεῖ], which would take account of [who desired to make a reckoning
24 with][1] his servants. And when he had [only] begun to reckon, one was brought[2] unto
25 him, which [who] owed *him* ten thousand talents. But forasmuch as he had not [as he
was not able] to pay, his lord commanded him to be sold, and his wife, and children,
26 and all that he had, and payment to be made. The servant therefore fell down, and
27 worshipped him, saying, Lord,[3] have patience with me, and I will pay thee all. Then
the lord of that servant was moved with compassion, and loosed [released] him, and
28 forgave him the debt. But the same servant went out, and found one of his fellow ser-

vants, which [who] owed him a hundred pence [shillings? lit.: denáries, δηνάρια]:[4] and
he laid hands on him, and took *him* by the throat, saying, Pay me[5] that thou [Pay if
29 thou][6] owest. And his fellow servant fell down at his feet,[7] and besought him, saying,
30 Have patience with me, and I will pay thee all.[8] And he would not: but went and
31 cast him into prison, till he should pay the debt. So when his fellow servants saw what
was done, they were very sorry, and came and told unto their [own, ἑαυτῶν] lord all
32 that was done. Then his lord, after that he had called him, said unto him, O thou
wicked servant, I forgave thee all that debt, because thou desiredst [besoughtest] me:
33 Shouldest not thou also have had compassion [pity] on thy fellow servant, even as I
34 had pity on thee? And his lord was wroth, and delivered him to the tormentors, till
35 he should pay all that was due unto him.[9] So likewise shall my heavenly Father do
also unto you, if ye from your hearts forgive not every one his brother their trespasses.[10]

[1] Ver. 23.—[Ὃς ἠθέλησε συνᾶραι λόγον μετά, κ.τ.λ.; Lange: *welcher abrechnen wollte, i. e., to make a reckoning or settlement.* Comp. 2 Kings xxi. 7, where the E. V. correctly renders: *There was no reckoning made with them of the money*, etc. The Authorized Version in our place conveys a different meaning in modern English.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 24.—Προσήχθη [for the more usual word: προσηνέχθη] in Codd. B., D., Origen, Lachmann, Tischendorf, [Alford].

[3] Ver. 26.—Κύριε is omitted in B., D., etc., and by Lachmann, Tischendorf, [Alford].

[4] Ver. 28.—[The English *penny* is less than one seventh of a *denarius*, a Roman silver coin equivalent to the Attic drachma, or about seven and a half pence sterling or fifteen American cents in value. *See* the *Dictionaries*. The inaptness of the usual English rendering (in all the old English versions) appears more fully in ch. xx. 2, where laborers are hired "*for a penny a day*," instead of nearly eight times that amount. About two thirds of a *denarius* a day was the pay of a Roman soldier. As there is no corresponding English coin, it is necessary to adopt an inaccurate rendering or the foreign word *denáry*, which would require a marginal explanation. *Shilling* (in the New York sense, *i. e.*, one eighth of an American dollar) would come nearest, but would lead to confusion, since the English shilling is nearly double in value (23 cents). Ewald, however, in his German translation, renders: *Schillinge*. Lange retains Luther's *Groschen*, but adds in parenthesis *Denare, Zehner* (*dimes*). Campbell and Norton: *denarii* (which might do in a learned Commentary, but not in a Bible for popular use); Conant, and the N. T. of the Am. Bible Union, better: *denáries*. It is surprising that Trench in his interpretation of the parable of the Unmerciful Servant (p. 151) and that of the Laborers in the Vineyard (p. 170), takes no notice whatever of this mistranslation and speaks repeatedly of *an hundred pence* as if it were all right.—P. S.]

[5] Ver. 28.—Codd. B., D., L., etc., omit μοι, *me*.

[6] Ver. 28.—The reading εἴ τι is best attested and much stronger than ὅ τι. It is a demand for payment in the form of a rebuke: Thou wretch, he who owes, must pay! [Ewald and Lange translate: *Bezahle, wenn du was schuldig bist! Pay, if thou owest anything.* Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Alford unanimously adopt the reading: Ἀπόδος εἴ τι ὀφείλεις, which is now sustained also by Cod. Sinait. Dr. Conant ignores this difference of reading.—P. S.]

[7] Ver. 29.—The addition of the received text: εἰς τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ (*at his feet*) is omitted in Codd. B., C., D., etc. [Tischendorf and Alford retain and defend the words against Lachmann, Tregelles, and Meyer, who omit them.—P. S.]

[8] Ver. 29.—The best authorities [also Cod. Sinait.] omit πάντα (*all*), which seems to be inserted to conform to ver. 26.

[9] Ver. 34.—B., D., etc., omit αὐτῷ. [Lachmann and Alford omit it, Tischendorf retains it.—P. S.]

[10] Ver. 35.—B., D., L., etc., omit the words: τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν (*their trespasses*), which seem to be inserted from ch. vi. 14, 15; Mark xi. 25, 26. [Cod. Sinait., and all the critical editors, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, omit the words.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 21. **Until seven times,** ἕως ἑπτάκις.—The directions of Christ in regard to the discipline of the Church presuppose readiness to forgive. If our brother listen to our admonition, and be reconciled, he is to be forgiven. But the Lord had not indicated how often this mercy was to be exercised. It seemed to Peter as if there must be some limit in the matter. His query indicated that he still regarded forgiveness as something outward and quantitative, rather than as something inward and spiritual. His proposal, "until seven times"—the sacred number—is very characteristic of his state of mind. It was, however, greatly in excess of the rabbinical ordinances, which prescribed forgiveness only three times: "*Homini in alterum peccanti semel remittunt, secundo remittunt, tertio remittunt, quarto non remittunt.*" *Babyl. Joma.*—[The Jewish rabbins based the duty of forgiving three times and no more, upon Amos i. 3; ii. 6; Job xxxiii. 29, 30. Peter, under the influence of the spirit of Christian charity, increased the number to seven, because in the Old Testament this number is closely linked with the idea of the covenant and of forgiveness, as well as with that of retribution; comp. Lev. xxv. 28; xxvi. 18, 21, 24, 28; Ps. xxviii. 25; Dan. iv. 15; Rev. xv. 1. —P. S.]

Ver. 22. **I say not unto thee;**—*i. e.*, I do not prescribe to thee.

Seventy times seven, ἑβδομηκοντάκις ἑπτά.—Jerome, Erasmus, Grotius, de Wette, [Trench], and others, explain seventy times sevenfold [*i. e.*, four hundred and ninety times]. But Origen, Augustine, Bengel, Ewald, and Meyer, explain seventy times and seven, or seventy-seven times, as ἑπτάκις does not again occur at ἑβδομηκοντάκις ἑπτά. Meyer says: "According to the Greek idiom, this should have been expressed either by ἑπτὰ καὶ ἑβδομηκοντάκις or by ἑβδομήκοντα ἑπτάκις. But the expression is derived from the Sept., Gen. iv. 24: 'If Cain shall be avenged sevenfold, truly Lamech seventyfold and seven.'"* The reference

* [Jerome already observed this significant contrast of our Lord's seventy times seven of forgiveness to the antediluvian Lamech's seventy and sevenfold of revenge. So Trench asserts (p. 145), referring to Jerome's works, vol. ii. p. 565, of the Benedictine edition. But I cannot find the passage in the Vallarsi edition, which I have before me. In his Commentary on Matt. *in loc.* (Opera, tom. vii. col. 141, ed. Vall.) Jerome makes no allusion to Gen. iv. 24, and says simply: "*Non usque septies, sed usque septuagies*

seems to be in point; all the more, that the saying of Christ was probably intended to form a direct contrast to the revenge which Lamech imprecated. Still, even though we bear in mind the symbolical import of the number seven, yet the bare addition of that numeral seems peculiar, and almost detracting from the force of the injunction. It might, indeed, be urged, that, according to the analogy of 101, it implied nothing more than as it were the measure seventy shaken and pressed down. First, seventy times, and then, if you like, in addition to this, your own seven times! But Grotius translates Gen. iv. 24, שִׁבְעִים וְשִׁבְעָה, *septuagies et id ipsum septies;* nor does the translation of the Sept. seem to us decidedly in favor of the opposite view. Besides, seventy times sevenfold seems to us a more apt symbolical expression for never-ending forgiveness than seventy times seven. However, grammatically and philologically, the point is not clear. Seventy is seven times ten, or the symbolical number of the world multiplied by that of the covenant. Of course, the expression is intended to indicate by the figure of a large number the quality of endless forgiveness. This view was already advocated by Theophylact.

Ver. 23. **Therefore is the kingdom of heaven likened.**—Referring to the reply which had been given to Peter. The parable which follows is intended to illustrate the teaching of Christ about our readiness to forgive. Meyer maintains that the Saviour insists upon unlimited forgiveness, and not, as de Wette suggests, merely upon readiness to forgive. But the latter implies the former; and, in fact, the two are identical in point of principle. The act of forgiveness presupposes genuine repentance on the part of our brother.—*Likened.* On account of the guilt of man, it had become necessary that the kingdom of heaven should rest on compassion as its foundation.

Unto a human king.*—The expression is intended to mark the antithesis to the heavenly King. —**His servants.**—Here represented as administering his possessions.—**He desired to make a reckoning,** or **settlement.**—This refers to eternal justice ever seeking to right matters, and to the impending judgment; hence more especially to the economy of the law and its results.

Ver. 24. **But when he had only† begun.**—Very solemn and significant.—**One was brought unto him,**—*i. e.*, one of the first and highest.—**Ten thousand talents.**—"An expression intended to indicate the infinite debt incurred, which could never be discharged. As it were an immense number of the largest coin." The Attic talent was equal to 60 *minæ* [6,000 *drachmæ*], or 1,375 Prussian dollars (*see* Boeckh's *Staatshaushalt der Athener*, i. 15),‡ and the mine to 100 *denarii*.§ "Hence one talent = 6,000 *denarii*, and 10,000 talents = 60,000,000 *denarii*." Gerlach suggests that the Saviour referred to the Syrian talent, which was much smaller than the Attic, amounting only to about one-fourth of it. According to the value of the Attic talent, the sum-total would amount to over 13 millions of Prussian dollars.

Ver. 25. **His lord commanded him to be sold.**—In accordance with the law of Moses, Exod. xxii. 3; Lev. xxv. 39; 2 Kings iv. 1. *See* also MICHAELIS' *Laws of Moses*, § 148.—**And (thus) payment to be made.**—The sum obtained would, of course, prove wholly inadequate. Still Fritzsche is mistaken in explaining it as meaning that the sum realized was actually to be paid. De Wette renders it: "And that *this* should be paid." Better Meyer in more general terms, "and payment to be made." The leading idea is, that the king insists upon payment being made. The exact amount is subordinate.

Ver. 28. **A hundred denaries.**—Equal to nearly 21 Prussian [or 15 American] dollars. *See* the article in the Encycls.—**Took him by the throat.** —According to Roman law, a creditor was allowed to drag his debtor by the throat before the tribunal. The harsh form in which he demanded payment deserves special attention. His address to his fellow-servant implied his own condemnation. Meyer rightly objects to the view of Fritzsche and Olshausen, who explain the expression εἴ τι as due to Greek urbanity. Others regard it as equivalent to ὅτι. Paulus and Baumgarten-Crusius understand it as implying that it was uncertain whether such a debt had really been incurred. In our view, it was intended by way of expressing reproof—the claimant all the time forgetting his own case and difficulties, which were not only similar, but even much worse. In fact, it would seem as if the remission of his debt had only called forth pride and self-confidence. His fellow-servant humbled himself in a more becoming manner than he had done before his master (προσεκύνει αὐτῷ, παρεκάλει αὐτόν); although we should bear in mind that in the latter case the creditor was the lord and king of the servant.

[TRENCH: "Such is man, so harsh and hard, when he walks otherwise than in a constant sense of forgiveness received from God. Ignorance or forgetfulness of his own guilt makes him harsh, unforgiving, and cruel to others; or, at best, he is only hindered from being such by those weak defences of natural character which may at any moment be broken down."—P. S.]

Ver. 31. **Their own (ἑαυτῶν) lord.**—Meyer accounts for the word ἑαυτῶν by remarking, "They had recourse neither to their hard-hearted companion nor to any other person." But this would scarcely have required special mention. On the other hand, their appeal to his and their lord exposed them to danger, if his anger should burst forth against them also. Still, they ventured to apply to him—compassion and sorrow inspiring them with courage. In this case, then, we see severity from pity, as formerly harshness in spite of mercy.

Ver. 34. **And delivered him to the tormentors.**—The *imprisonment* refers in both cases to temporary confinement, until payment should be made.

septies, id est, quadringentis nonaginta vicibus, ut toties peccanti fratri dimitteret in die, quoties ille peccare non possit."—P. S.]

* [Meyer likewise emphasizes ἀνθρώπῳ, which the English Version renders: *a certain king.* "*Zu* βασιλεῖ *ist nicht ohne Grund* ἀνθρώπῳ *zugesetzt, da das* HIMMELREICH *mit einem* MENSCHLICHEN *Könige verglichen wird. Vergleiche übrigens das Homerische* ἀνὴρ βασιλεύς."—P. S.]

† [Dr. Lange inserts *only*, to emphasize ἀρξαμένου at the beginning of the sentence.—P. S.]

‡ [Dr. Robinson, *Dictionary*, *sub* τάλαντον, estimates the common Attic talent at £243 15s. sterling, or about $1,170.—P. S.]

§ [The original reads 10 for 100 *denarii*,—a palpable printing error, which the Edinb. transl. faithfully copies. "*Attica* μνᾶ *(mina) fuit centum drachmarum; Romana, drachmarum nonaginta sex; Alexandrina* 160 *drachmarum Atticarum.*" *See* JOA. SCAPULÆ, *Lexicon Græco-Lat.*, Oxford ed., p. 1006. An Attic δραχμή is nearly equal in value to a Roman *denarius*.—P. S.]

But, besides this, the servant whom his master now sent to prison was also delivered τοῖς βασανισταῖς, "*to the tormentors*," to be tormented by them. The punishment of being sold into slavery, with which he had formerly been threatened, was much lighter than that which he had now to endure. However, the king was generous, and the wife and children of the offender were not molested. In its first form, they shared the guilt of that wicked servant; but the sin which he had now committed rested upon himself alone. Still, except in reference to the manner in which payment is now enforced, the language of the parable continues the same as before. The imprisonment and the torments are intended to enforce payment; but as, in the present instance, this is manifestly impossible, they serve in reality as a punishment. Fritzsche renders the term βασανισταί by "body-guard of the king" (!); Grotius, by "gaolers" [δεσμοφύλακες]; Meyer, correctly, by "tormentors."* According to the sentence pronounced, the imprisonment would necessarily be both never-ending and hopeless (Chrysostom: τουτέστι διηνεκῶς, οὔτε γὰρ ἀποδώσει ποτέ). Still, we are scarcely warranted in referring these torments to the sufferings of Gehenna.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The symbolical import of the number *seven* is spiritual and festive rest after the work has been finished; *ten*, that of the world. Hence the number seventy represents the power of the Spirit as conquering the world (the 70 disciples). Again, seventy times seven would convey the all-conquering power of the Spirit in all His fulness, as reconciling us, and rendering us willing to be reconciled. The largeness of the number would indicate that there was to be no measuring or limitation in the exercise of kindness; but that infinite love was, in its fulness and strength, to sweep all barriers, and that forgiveness was to be bounded by no other limits than those demanded by truth, *i. e.*, more especially, by the state of mind of him who had offended against us.

2. This parable must not be applied merely to the private relations subsisting between Christians; but also refers to the general administration of the servants of the Lord in the Church, which, however, if improperly exercised, may degenerate into a matter of private interest or favor. Under such circumstances, the contrast between the wondrous pardon granted by the Master, and the cruel exactions made by the servants, would appear in the most glaring manner. Strange, that the most harsh and heartless treatment should be connected with the dispensation of highest mercy! Compare the history of church discipline in the middle ages, and the bitter controversies on the doctrine of the holy Communion.

3. FAUSTUS SOCINUS ("*De Christo Servatore*") argues from this passage, that as the king forgave without ransom or surety, so God similarly pardons sinners. To this OLEARIUS replies, that the object of this parable was to delineate the subjective condition of pardon on our part, not the objective ground of acceptance with God. Besides, each separate parable was not intended to give the whole scheme of salvation. Perhaps, however, it were more accurate to say, that the objective ground of compassion is embodied and presented in the atonement made by Christ. But the latter point was not intended to be presented in this parable. [Meyer remarks that the parable implies a ὕστερον πρότερον, since the infinite forgiving mercy of God could only appear fully in the atoning death of Christ.—P. S.]

[4. *Till he pay all that was due unto him*, ver. 34. The offender, it seems, is not imprisoned for the act of unmercifulness to his fellow-servant, but for his old debt to God which had been forgiven him. But it must be remembered that every sin against our neighbor, or against ourselves, is at the same time a sin against God, and so the conduct of the unmerciful servant contracted a new debt due to God. This passage is often quoted in the discussion of the question: *Utrum peccata semel remissa redeant*, whether sins once forgiven return on the sinner through his subsequent transgressions? HAMMOND says, the king revoked his *designed* mercy; but the debt was *actually* and absolutely forgiven; yet forgiven, of course, as always, on certain moral conditions, the violation of which implies the forfeiture of the benefit. Forgiveness is inseparable from union with Christ. If we forsake Him we relapse into a state of nature, which is a state of wrath; yea, our case becomes much worse than it was before conversion, and our guilt increases in proportion to the mercies received. How many, alas! forfeit the benefit of baptism, *i. e.*, the remission of sins, by a life of impenitence and ingratitude, and become worse than heathen.—P. S.]

[5. The same verse (and ver. 26) is also quoted by some Roman Catholic interpreters for the doctrine of purgatory, and by Universalists and Restorationists, for the doctrine of the final salvation of all men. In both cases the ἕως οὗ is pressed as implying a final discharge of the debt and a consequent deliverance from the prison of purgatory or a temporary hell. But this argument proceeds on the radically wrong assumption that man can atone for his sins or discharge his moral debt to God. The debt is expressly represented, in ver. 24, as enormous, so as to make it impossible for any human being to discharge it. The debt, moreover, instead of diminishing is daily accumulating; since the utmost that man can do is to perform his *present* duty, comp. Luke xvii. 10. The phrase: *till he pay all*, etc., ἕως οὗ ἀποδῷ πᾶν, like the proverbial *ad numum solvere*, *ad extremum assem solvere*, signifies that the debtor shall have justice without mercy and taste the extreme rigor of the law. TRENCH (p. 158) goes even further, and says: "Since the sinner could never acquit the slightest portion of the debt in which he is indebted to God, the putting that as a condition of his liberation, which it is impossible could ever be fulfilled, is the strongest possible way of expressing the eternal duration of his punishment." MALDONATUS, one of the best Roman Catholic expounders, remarks: "QUOUSQUE REDDERET. *Id est semper, ut Chrysostomus, Euthymius et Theophylactus interpretantur; non enim significatur, fore, ut, qui damnati sunt, pœnas aliquando persolvant et, quasi reddito debito, liberentur, qui Origenistarum error fuit; sed fore,*

* [Among the ancient Romans there were certain legal tortures, as a heavy chain and a system of half starvation, which the creditor might apply to his debtor, for bringing him to terms. *See* ARNOLD, *History of Rome*, i. p. 186, and TRENCH, *Notes on the Parables*, p. 154: "The *tormentors* are those who shall make the life of the prisoner bitter to him; wring out from him the confession of any concealed hoards which he may still possess; even as there are *tormentors* in that world of woe, whereof this prison is a figure —fellow-sinners and evil angels—instruments of the just yet terrible judgments of God."—P. S.]

ut numquam liberentur, nisi pœnas persolvant, quas quia persolvere numquam poterunt, numquam liberabuntur." OLSHAUSEN *in loc.* (vol. i. p. 594, American edition) admits that the debt of the sinner to God can never possibly be liquidated; nevertheless he infers partly from the ἕως οὗ, partly from the servant's acknowledgment of his debt that he will be finally released. I cannot see how we can hold this opinion without adopting substantially the Roman Catholic dogma of purgatory. But ἕως does not necessarily fix a limit beyond which the preëxisting state of things *must cease* (comp. the Saviour's promise to be with His people to the end of the world, ἕως τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος); and if the mere *admission* of sin and guilt insures ultimate salvation, a Judas might have been saved as well who confessed that he betrayed innocent blood.—Comp. also the *Notes* on ch. v. 26 (p. 114) and on ch. xii. 32 (pp. 225 and 227 sqq.).—P. S.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

"Till seven times?" or, the tendency of the class of which Peter is the type to count and limit spiritual acts.—Acts of forgiveness, prayers, and similar deeds, should not be *counted.*—Seventy times seven; or, the sacred number,—which implies that our love must not be limited by the rules of arithmetic.—The kingdom of heaven under the figure of reckoning: 1. The king reckoning; or, the remission of an infinite debt. 2. The servant reckoning; or, the harsh demand of a small claim. 3. The final reckoning of the king occasioned by that of the servant.—The great alternations in the kingdom of heaven, occasioned by the unfaithfulness of man in opposition to the faithfulness of God: 1. From the judgment of the law to the mercy of the gospel; 2. from mercy to judgment.—The grace of God has converted the economy of the law into that of the gospel; but the unmercifulness of Christians seeks to transform the dispensation of the gospel into one of judgment.—How could the servant who had been forgiven act with such cruelty against his fellow-servant? 1. It was suspicious, that he who apparently was among the first of his fellow-servants should have incurred so heavy a debt without accounting for the money long before that; 2. it was still worse when he only plead for delay, promising payment which he well knew he never could make; 3. but it fully indicated his state of mind, when he could go from the presence of his master cherishing such feelings of pride and bitterness.—The unconditional and the conditional remission of debt in the kingdom of God: 1. The former is full and irrevocable; the latter is only granted to try us. 2. The former is real, both in respect of its basis and its character; the latter only emblematical. 3. The former leads to humility and compassion; the latter may readily call forth pride and harshness in the unconverted.—The unmerciful are equally destitute of feeling and memory. A. 1. They forget their own guilt and humiliation; 2. the pardon extended to them; 3. nor are they even reminded of it by the entreaty of a fellow-servant, so similar to their own pleading; 4. they only remember it in the hour of final judgment. B. Such persons have only a heartless memory for their own selfishness, for their own claims, demands, etc.—How the remission of our immeasurable debt should induce us to forgive the small debt incurred by our brother: 1. We are bound to do so; 2. enabled; and, 3. impelled to it.—How the harshness and cruelty of those who are proud and insecure seems to come out in all its fulness in the gospel kingdom of grace.—How the evil disposition of the servants has transformed: 1. The gospel of grace into compulsory conversions; 2. the call to repentance into forced penance; 3. the discipline of the Church into the tortures of the Inquisition; the exhibition of the Redeemer into a call for the Judge.—Guilt under the law called forth grace; but harshness under the gospel will bring down the judgment, Matt. xxv. 31, etc.—The complaint of the fellow-servants in its effects, viewed historically.—Heavy judgments impending on those who show no mercy, James ii. 13.—How unmercifulness introduces an order of things which ensures its own ruin.—The tormentors and torments of the next world in their relation to those of this life.—Unmercifulness is practical unbelief.—The practical bearing of this second fall.—The domestic guilt which is remitted, and the personal guilt which is retained.—"So likewise," etc. Or, this parable as specially applicable to the Apostles, and the servants of Christ both in Church and State.—"My heavenly Father." 1. The Father of mercy, and of the Saviour—grace itself. 2. The Father of the Judge of the world—justice itself. 3. The Father of Christ in the congregation, or of the Church.

Starke:—*Canstein:* It is a great honor to be in the employment of a mighty potentate; how much more, then, to be a servant of the King of kings and the Lord of lords! What faithfulness and care are requisite in such a service!—God will require an account of all that has been entrusted to our stewardship: Job ix. 3; Ps. cxxx. 3; cxliii. 2.—*Osiander:* Sin has subjected not only our persons, but all we have, to the curse.—The natural man is not willing to rely on free grace, and to trust for atonement and righteousness to Christ alone; but would always like to contribute something of his own.—Forgetfulness of the freeness of God's gifts a fruitful cause of relapse into sin.—*Quesnel:* As genuine love to God and compassionate affection toward our neighbor is a fruit of genuine conversion, so is ingratitude toward God and hardheartedness toward our neighbor an evidence of spurious religion.—*Canstein:* To insist on full restitution, is to be inexorable.—Your fellow-servants will see it, and lay the case before their Master.—*Quesnel:* To be unwilling to forgive an offence, is to provoke the wrath both of heaven and earth.—Feigned penitence is like that wicked servant, promising all, but performing nothing, Ps. xii. 6.—The Lord quotes the example of men, in order to render them inexcusable.—Would we like to know whether we have obtained forgiveness from God? Let us ask ourselves how we stand affected toward others.—Forgive, and He will forgive you.

Lisco:—God reckons with us when setting before us, in our consciences and by His word, His law and His just demands.—By his harshness the wicked servant loses the affection and esteem of his fellow-servants, nor can his conduct remain concealed.

Heubner:—This command to be ever willing to forgive, implies much rich and blessed comfort.—If man is to forgive so frequently, how much more will our Father in heaven be ready to extend mercy!—Unless we rightly know the extent of our guilt, we cannot properly appreciate the fulness of grace which the Lord is willing and ready to vouchsafe.—How our sins ever involve others in ruin, and generally those nearest and dearest to us.—"We should despair of being ever able to discharge our debt, and rely on grace and mercy alone."—What contrasts

here! 1. God, the King of kings, toward a servant; and again a servant toward his fellow-servant. 2. An infinite debt, and again a small debt. 3. Impossibility and inability; and again, possibility and ability. 4. Compassion and kindness; and again, hardheartedness and cruel behavior.—Woe to him whom the tears and sighs of those who are oppressed and injured accuse before the tribunal of God.—A harsh person calls down the judgments of God upon himself.

Reinhard:—What obligation God lays upon us to forgive those who offend against us.—*Kuinoel*:—The character of self-righteousness: 1. Confession of debt; 2. promise of payment; 3. the manner in which this promise is kept; 4. the sad issue of the whole matter.—[*Bourdalue*:—Sur le pardon des injures. Serm. 34. Pour le 21 Dimanche après la Pentecôte.—*Massilon*:—Du pardon des offenses,—and other famous Catholic sermons on the pericope, vers. 23–35.—P. S.]

THIRD SECTION.

THE PRIESTLY FAMILY IN THE CHURCH.

Chapter XIX. 1–26.

Contents:—This section sets before us, in their remarkable connection, the three principal features of the Christian household as it should exist in the Church of Christ: viz., the marriage-relationship in the Church, ch. xix. 1–12; children in the Church, vers. 13–15; and property in the Church, vers. 16–26.

Historical Connection.—After the transaction at Capernaum, recorded in Matt. xviii., the Lord commenced His festive journey to Jerusalem, in company with His disciples, Luke xiii. 22–30. On this occasion the Pharisees attempted—probably at the instigation of Herod—to frighten the Lord into a speedy removal from Galilee, vers. 31–35. They next invited Him to a feast, in the hope of thus ensnaring Him, Luke xiv. 1–24. The Lord now set before those of His followers who were not yet decided for Him, the dangers connected with discipleship, Luke xiv. 25–35. On the other hand, He declared His readiness to receive penitent publicans and sinners, Luke xv. 1–17. The festive company now entered the territory of Samaria, but were not allowed to pass through it (Luke ix. 51–62). This refusal to receive Him led to the sending forth of the seventy disciples (Luke x. 1–16). The Lord next took a sorrowing retrospect of Galilee (Matt. xi. 20–30); and then passed into Peræa through the boundary land of Samaria and Galilee (Luke xvii. 11–19). The return of the seventy disciples (Luke x. 17–37). Jesus arrived in Peræa previous to the transactions recorded in Matt. xix. (Matt. xix. 1, 2). The Evangelists have not preserved many of the details connected with Christ's twofold visit to Peræa, *before* and *after* the feast of the Dedication of the Temple, during the winter of the year 782. Thus much, however, clearly appears, that He was gladly received in that district. We are told that, during His first stay there (Matt. xix. 2), "great multitudes followed Him there, and He healed them (their sick)." Of His second visit to Peræa we read, that "many resorted unto Him," and "believed on Him there" (John x. 40–42). The events recorded in the section under consideration, most probably occurred while the Saviour visited Peræa the second time. According to the account in the Gospel of Mark, the rich young man came to the Lord *when He was gone forth into the way*; according to Matthew, He departed from Galilee after having laid His hands on children,—an act which the Evangelist seems to connect with His teaching on the subject of divorce (*see* the *Leben Jesu*, ii. 2, p. 1079).

During his journey to Peræa, where Jesus on the first occasion made only a very brief stay, He replied to the intrusive and curious question, whether few or many were to be saved (Luke xiii. 23). It was probably in Peræa that He uttered the parable concerning the Pharisee and the publican, and several others which are recorded in the Gospel by Luke. He next appeared at Jerusalem at the feast of the Dedication of the Temple (John x. 22–40), which, according to Wieseler, commenced that year on the 25th December. Once more the Jews now tempted Him with the question, whether He was the Messiah (in their sense of the designation—the inquiry being urged partly from motives of hostility, and partly in the hope of having their carnal expectations realized). In their peculiar state of mind, the reply of Jesus implied both more and less than they had anticipated or wished. Hence they wished to stone Him. But He passed majestically through the midst of them, and—protected by His followers—soon appeared a second time in Peræa, in the same locality, where afterward, at Pella, His Church

found a refuge. But in Peræa also He was met by Pharisees, who had been stirred up and instructed by their colleagues at Jerusalem. Accordingly, questions similar to those set before Him in the capital of Judæa were now urged. With these the section under consideration opens.

It is quite in accordance with the plan adopted by Matthew in his Gospel, that only those portions are recorded in which the Christian family in the new Church is described in its various aspects and bearings.

A. *Marriage in the Church.* CH. XIX. 1–12.

(Mark x. 1–12.)

And it came to pass, *that* when Jesus had finished these sayings, he departed from
Galilee, and came into the coasts [borders, τὰ ὅρια] of Judea beyond [the] Jordan;
2, 3 And great multitudes followed him; and he healed them there. The Pharisees also
came unto him [And there came to him Pharisees],[1] tempting him, and saying unto
4 him,[2] Is it lawful for a man[3] to put away his wife for every cause? And he answered
and said unto them,[4] Have ye not read, that he which [who] made *them* at the be-
ginning [from the beginning, ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς, *i. e.*, in paradise] made them male and female,
5 And said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his
6 wife: and they twain [the two, οἱ δύο] shall be one flesh? Wherefore they are no
more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put
7 asunder. They say unto him, Why [then] did Moses then command to give a writing
8 of divorcement, and to put her away? He saith unto them, Moses because of the
harshness of your hearts suffered you to put away your wives: but from the beginning
9 [ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς] it was not so. And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife,
except *it be* for fornication,[5] and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and whoso
10 marrieth her which [who] is put away doth commit [committeth] adultery. His dis-
ciples say unto him, If the case of the man be so with *his* wife [*i. e.*, if this is the legal rela-
11 tion between husband and wife], it is not good to marry. But he said unto them, All *men*
cannot [Not all, οὐ πάντες, can] receive this saying, save *they* to whom it is given.
12 For there are *some*[6] eunuchs, which [who] were so born from *their* [the] mother's
wombs: and there are *some* eunuchs, which [who] were made eunuchs of [by, ὑπό]
men: and there be [are] eunuchs, which [who] have made themselves eunuchs for the
kingdom of heaven's sake. He that is able to receive *it*, let him receive *it*.

[1] Ver. 3.—[Καὶ προσῆλθον αὐτῷ Φαρισαῖοι; the article οἱ of the *text. rec.* is wanting in the best MSS. and thrown out by the modern critical editors (except Tischendorf), also by Dr. Lange in his version.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 3.—[Αὐτῷ, *to him*, is likewise missing in the oldest authorities, also Cod. Sinait., and omitted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Alford.—P. S.]

[3] Ver. 3.—Ἀνθρώπῳ, *for a man*, is omitted by B., L., [Cod. Sinait.], and thrown out by Lachmann and Tischendorf; but seems to be required by ἐποίησεν αὐτούς.

[4] Ver. 4.—[Αὐτοῖς, *to them*, is omitted in the critical editions, but retained by Lange.—P. S.]

[5] Ver. 9.—Lachmann, with B., D., reads: παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας. Meyer regards it as a gloss from ch. v. 32. [The *text. rec.* reads: εἰ μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ; Tischendorf and Alford: μὴ ἐπὶ π., which reading is sustained also by Cod. Sinaiticus. Εἰ may easily be an explanatory addition. The sense is not affected in the least by this difference of reading.—P. S.]

[6] Ver. 12.—[*Some* before *eunuchs* is an interpolation of the E. V., and should be underscored or omitted.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1. And it came to pass.—The passage from Galilee to Peræa formed part of the journey of the Lord to Jerusalem. The circumstance, that Matthew (as well as Mark and Luke) only records the last journey of Jesus to Jerusalem, is readily explained from the general plan on which his narrative is constructed.

Into the borders; or, *boundary land.*—It deserves notice, that Jesus entered not merely the territory of Peræa, but penetrated to its utmost boundaries. According to Josephus (*Bell. Jud.* iii. 3, 3), Peræa proper (or "the other side," *i. e.*, of Jordan—ἡ περαία, sc. χώρα) extended from Moabitis, or from the Arnon, to Pella on the north—"certainly to the Sheriat Mandhur, since Josephus designates Gadara (Omkeis), which lay on the Mandhur, as the capital of Peræa. Toward the east, it adjoined, according to that writer, the territory of Gerasa, Rabbath Ammon, and Arabia." L. von Raumer. From the same authority we learn that Peræa, in the wider sense, embraced that part of Palestine which lay east of the Jordan, embracing the whole territory of Peræa from the sources of the Jordan to the Arnon. Lastly, a still wider meaning attached to that name, which was also given to the whole eastern part of the Jordan-valley, or the Ghor (Arabah), stretching from the sources of Jordan to the southern extremi-

ty of the Dead Sea, and running beyond it to the Elanitic Gulf, between the mountains of Edom in the east and the high coast on the west. When on former occasions traversing the lake (Cæsarea, Gadara), Jesus had visited Peræa in the second and last-mentioned acceptation of that term. Hence we conclude that He went at this time into Peræa proper, which formed part of the tetrarchy of Herod Antipas, who ruled over that province as well as over Galilee. From this circumstance we account for the fact that the Lord now betook Himself to the boundary districts, or *coasts*, of Peræa,—the latter term being scarcely applicable to the boundary district of Judæa itself.

A special interest and importance attaches to the province of Peræa, where Jesus retired on two occasions previous to His decease and found a refuge, and whither afterward His infant Church retired before the destruction of Jerusalem, seeking shelter among its mountains, and making Pella their capital. On the difficulties connected with the topography of Pella, comp. the author's *Apostol. Zeitalter*, ii. 461. Great probability, however, attaches to the suggestion of Robinson, who, according to his latest researches, places it on the site of the modern *Fahil*, between the Jabbok and the Hieromax; in which case, the statement of Josephus would refer to Pella as being a boundary town of Peræa, in the narrowest or political sense of the term. On the blessed work of Jesus in that province, comp. the author's *Leben Jesu*, ii. 2, p. 1094. The general conformation of the district is calcareous and cretaceous in the south, till beyond the Arnon, and basalt in the eastern portion. It is mountainous, with high plateaus, and traversed by many rivers. The northern part is woody, and suited for grazing (the oaks and bulls of Bashan); the southern, exceedingly fertile.

An attentive consideration of the narrative in the Gospels will easily enable us to answer the objection of Meyer and others, who deem the account of Matthew incompatible with that of Luke (ix. 51; xvii. 11), according to which, Jesus had passed through Samaria. The Lord had evidently intended to journey by Samaria. But when the inhabitants of that country refused to receive Him, He passed into Peræa through the boundary land of Galilee and Samaria (*see Leben Jesu*, ii. 2, 1053). Similarly, in answer to the alleged contradiction between our Gospel and John x. 22, 40—which records that Jesus went from Jerusalem to Peræa—we remind the reader, that the Lord visited that province on two different occasions.

Ver. 3. **Pharisees.**—Peræa was removed from the great centres of Jewish hierarchism. Hence the Saviour found there a sphere of labor even after He had been banished from Galilee and Judæa. But even there the sect of the Pharisees was by and by roused to acts of hostility, partly at the instigation of their colleagues at Jerusalem, and partly from personal rancor. On this and other grounds, we conclude that the transactions here recorded had taken place during the second visit of Jesus to Peræa. The question has been raised, wherein the "temptation" of this inquiry lay. Meyer suggests that it consisted in the attempt of involving Him in the discussion between the schools of Hillel and Shammai (*see* the *Exeget. Notes* on ch. v. 31). "It was hoped that, by His reply, Jesus would virtually support the view of one of these antagonistic schools —more particularly that of Shammai, and that thus the opposite party might be more fully enlisted against Him." But in that case He would also manifestly have gained the favor of the followers of Shammai. Ewald thinks that it was intended to entangle Jesus, while in the dominions of Herod Antipas—whose conduct in his married relationship John had reproved—in a declaration and fate similar to that of the Baptist. To this it has been objected—as we think, without sufficient reason—that there is no indication of such a scheme in the text. Meyer holds that the decision of Jesus was stricter than that of either of the schools. The statement is incorrect, as our Lord did not go beyond the principles laid down by Shammai; while, unlike that teacher, He did not convert the absolute principle of marriage in the Church into an outward and civil statute.

For every cause.—The question is manifestly put from the point of view taken by Hillel.

Ver. 4. **Made them,** or **created them.**—The ideas of ἄνθρωπος (which accordingly we retain as the reading) and γυνή are presupposed. The Lord explains that they were not created arbitrarily, or independently of, but *for* each other, and as suitable and adapted to each other; which is expressed by ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ, referring to the male and female nature. The two first individuals of the male and female sex were not merely *a* man and *a* woman, but *male* and *female*, in the sense of being destined and intended exclusively for each other. Hence they constituted the type of marriage in its full meaning and principle, as an indissoluble union.

Ver. 5. **And said.**—In Gen. ii. 24, these words are recorded as having been spoken by Adam, while in this place they are uttered as quoted by God,—not simply because every statement of Scripture is the word of the Lord, but, as Augustine [*De nupt.* ii. 4] expresses it, "*Deus utique per hominem dixit quod homo prophetando prædixit.*" Or rather, perhaps, because, before his fall, man uttered absolute spiritual truth, or what in point of fact was the word of God.

For this cause shall a man leave father and mother.—Added not merely by way of quotation, but to show that the relationship between a man and *his* wife was higher, stronger, and closer than even that toward his father and mother.

The two.—The expression does not occur in the original Hebrew, but is found in the Septuagint, as implied in the text, and bringing out more fully its idea and meaning. The two apparently different individualities are to become one flesh by marriage, *i. e.*, to form the generic unity of human nature. This unity, while implying the mental and moral elements, is based on that of the σάρξ, as indicating and completing the union.

Ver. 6. **No more,** or, *never more*, οὐκέτι.—Ver. 9 forms no exception to this rule, as the relationship there referred to is incompatible with, and in direct antagonism to, the idea of marriage.*

* [Vers. 3-6.—The Pharisees wished to entangle our Saviour in their scholastic party disputes on the marriage- and divorce-question and in the adultery-case of Herod Antipas, which caused the imprisonment and death of John the Baptist, and may have excited as much feeling and debate in its day as the divorce-case of Henry VIII. in the 16th century during the Reformation period. The Saviour answered the treacherous question of His enemies by referring them first (in ver. 4) to what God *did*, who in the original creation of man instituted the sexual relation and marriage as an indissoluble union between one man and one woman; secondly, to what God *said* through Adam as the representative of the race (in ver. 5), viz., that husband and wife are inseparably united, *i. e.*, within the limits of their life in the flesh, or their earthly life; and then He states His own irresistible conclu-

Vers. 7, 8. **Why did Moses then command?** Deut. xxiv. 1.—A misapplication of the passage, which the Lord exposes and censures. The object of Moses in laying down the rules about giving a writing of divorcement, was not to countenance or promote divorces, but to diminish their number by subjecting them to certain rules and limitations, with the view of again elevating the married relationship, and realizing its idea. Moses commanded, not that divorces should take place; he only enjoined that in such cases certain forms should be observed, and that the ground of the separation should be embodied in the "*writing of divorcement.*" But the Jewish Rabbins completely perverted the meaning and object of all this (ch. v. 31). Hence we note the twofold antithesis: "*Moses did* **command,**" "*Moses* **suffered;**" and again: "Moses did command" *in general*, and, "Moses suffered **you**" in particular. So far from having commanded it in general, he only suffered you individually, *because of the hardness of your hearts.*

Ver. 8. **From the beginning it was not so.**—In the original state of things in Paradise. The first instance of polygamy is recorded in Gen. iv. 19. It deserves special notice, that it appears in conjunction with murder, avenging of blood, and sinful poetry; and that it occurs in the line of Cain, not in that of Seth.

Ver. 9. **Except for fornication.**—An explanation of the עֶרְוַת דָּבָר. Comp. the *Exeg. Notes* on ch. v. 31, 32, p. 115. Roman Catholic writers are naturally anxious to have this clause omitted from the text (Hug, von Berlepsch), but there is no critical warrant for this.

Ver. 10. **It is not good to marry.**—The meaning of the disciples is: if the ideal principle laid down by our Lord about marriage was to be immediately and unconditionally applied to existing relations, then, etc. In His reply, Christ admits the difficulty of such application.

Ver. 11. **Not all can receive this saying.**—It requires divine illumination.

Ver. 12. The explanation of His further statement—**For there are eunuchs,** etc.—is exceedingly difficult. Neander thinks that Matthew inserted in this place something which the Lord had taught on the same subject on another occasion, and in quite a different connection. Certainly, the common interpretation, that Jesus here referred to the various exceptional cases in which marriage should be avoided, is very unsatisfactory. The three classes of *eunuchs* here enumerated (the expression being used figuratively for those who are not to enter the married relationship), are evidently intended to embrace *all* the grounds on which marriage was inadmissible. First of all, then, there is a class of eunuchs **who were so born from the mother's womb,** *i. e.*, who are physically disqualified for marriage, such as those laboring under disease, or whose mental or bodily organization is defective. Next, there was another class "**who were made eunuchs by men.**" As, in the first and third class enumerated, the term *eunuch* is evidently used in a figurative manner, we take it in the same sense here—the more so, as in the literal sense it would apply to a comparatively small number of persons. Hence we regard it as referring in general to those who are prevented from entering into marriage, in the highest and only true import of the idea, by social and moral considerations, and who are hence in duty bound to renounce the married state. The last class to which the Saviour alludes, consists of those **who have made themselves eunuchs for the sake of the kingdom of heaven,** *i. e.*, those who, being married, yet for the kingdom of heaven's sake are as if they were not married, *i. e.*, are ever ready to sacrifice their conjugal enjoyments for the sake of their spiritual calling; or—as the Apostle expresses it, 1 Cor. vii. 29—have wives as though they had none.—Thus this threefold renunciation, which, in accordance with the divine will and purpose, runs through the actual marriage-relationship,—viz., the renunciation of natural union, or of ideal union, or of the full enjoyment of the married estate,—was to form the basis on which this relationship was henceforth to rest. Such a union was to combine the elements of deep personal attachment and interchange of soul with subordination to the divine arrangements and requirements in the theocracy, where this as well as every other good gift should be regarded as secondary, and subservient to the grand purposes of the kingdom of God (*Leben Jesu*, ii. 2, p. 1103). The expression εὐνουχίζειν is also used by the Cabbalists in a figurative sense. It is strange that Roman Catholic divines (as, for example, SEPP, *Leben Jesu*, iii. 117) should have quoted in support of celibacy a passage which, in reality, so far from representing marriage as something beneath the disciples, elevated that relationship far above the views and circumstances of the times, and placed it on a high and spiritual platform. Similarly absurd is the notion of Strauss, that this passage savors of Essenism, which degraded woman, while the Saviour here restored her right position. Comp. Ebrard, p. 453. It is well known that a misunderstanding of the import of this passage induced Origen literally to carry it into execution,—a historical fact, which has latterly been again established by Engelhart and Redepenning against Schnitzer and others.

[*Note.*—I beg leave to differ from Dr. Lange's figurative exposition of the second and third class of eunuchs; which last would, in this case, embrace all Christians, since temperance and chastity is a fundamental virtue and duty for the married as well as the single state, and since all are required to subordinate their earthly relations to their spiritual calling. As I understand the mysterious passage, the Saviour distinguishes three kinds of eunuchism: (1) *congenital*, which implies neither merit nor guilt; (2) *forced*, which implies misfortune on the one hand and guilt on the other; (3) *voluntary*, which has moral value and merit if it proceeds from faith and love to Christ, but no merit superior to chastity in the married state. The first and third are only improperly called eunuchism. To speak more fully, the first class of eunuchs embraces the comparatively small number of those who are constitu-

sion (in ver. 6) in a sentence which is since repeated in every marriage ceremony in Christian lands, and will be repeated to the end of time to inaugurate and protect with its divine authority and power this holy and fundamental relation.—We add the remarks of Dr. ALFORD on vers. 4–6: (1) Our Lord refers to the Mosaic account of the Creation as a *historical fact*, and grounds His argument on the *literal* expressions of that narrative. (2) He cites both from the first and second chapters of Genesis, showing them to be consecutive parts of a continuous narrative. (3) He quotes words of Adam (Gen. ii. 21) as spoken by the Creator; they must, therefore, be understood as said in prophecy, *divino afflatu*, the more so since the relations alluded to by those terms did not yet exist. (4) The force of the argument consists in the *previous unity* of male and female, not indeed organically, but by implication, in Adam. He made *them*, *i. e.*, man as a race, *male* (not *a* male), *and female* (not *a* female).—P. S.]

tionally either incapable of, or averse to, marriage; the second class, the eunuchs proper, or mutilated persons, who at that time were quite numerous, especially at courts, and are still found in Eastern countries, among heathens and Mohammedans (yea, even in the choir of the papal Sixtine chapel in Rome; the famous *Miserere* being sung by the clear silver voices of these unfortunate victims of sacred art); the third class, those who deliberately abstain from marriage either altogether, or from second marriage after the death of their first husband or wife, not, however, for the purpose of thereby *gaining* the kingdom of heaven (*ad regnum cœlorum* PROMERENDUM, as Origen, Hilarius, Euthymius, Maldonatus, and the Roman Commentators generally misinterpret the words διὰ τὴν βασιλείαν τ. οὐρ.), but for the purpose of *working* for the kingdom of heaven from pure and disinterested love to Christ, believing that they can serve Him more unreservedly and effectually in the single state, or remain more steadfast in times of peculiar trial and persecution (διὰ τὴν ἐνεστῶσαν ἀνάγκην, 1 Cor. vii. 26). To this class belong St. Paul (1 Cor. vii. 7, 26), Barnabas (1 Cor. ix. 5, 6), probably also St. John (who in the Greek Church bears the standing title, ὁ παρθένος, with reference to his virgin purity), and thousands of missionaries, divines, ministers and pious laymen, sisters of charity, virgins and widows in all ages and among Protestants as well as Catholics. The great and serious error of the Roman Church consists in making a law for the whole clergy of what the Saviour left to free choice on the basis of a special calling and gift of God (ver. 11), and in attaching a superior merit to celibacy at the expense of the holy and normal state of marriage. From a grossly literal misunderstanding of ver. 12, Origen, in the youthful ardor of enthusiasm for Christ, and misguided by the ascetic notions of his age, committed the unnatural deed which forever disqualified him for marriage. But this was justly condemned in the ancient church, and was made subsequently a reason for his excommunication from the church of Alexandria.—On the whole subject of marriage and celibacy in the N. T., comp. SCHAFF's *History of the Apostolic Church*, § 112, pp. 448–454.—P. S.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. Compare our remarks on Matt. v., p. 115 sq., and the foregoing *Exegetical Notes*.

2. The scribes seem always to have been entangled in the antagonistic views of Shammai and Hillel. But Christ here calls their attention to a very different kind of antagonism,—viz., that between the fundamental, eternal, and absolute principle of marriage, and the theocratic or political law on the subject. So far as the *principle* of marriage was concerned, every such union was necessarily indissoluble, being based on the fact, that man and woman were destined for each other. But in point of fact this principle had been lost sight of, equally because unions were improperly formed, and because they were improperly dissolved. Hence, the object of Moses was to keep this heathen degeneracy within bounds. By means of the "writing of divorcement," he wished gradually again to train the Jews by the law, so as to elevate their views, and to introduce among them marriage in the true and spiritual sense. But this measure was frustrated and perverted for the opposite purpose, by the loose and lascivious interpretations put upon it by the Rabbins. In our opinion, it is the duty of legislators and magistrates not to degenerate into literalism, or to go beyond the above principle, as Romanism has done, but to see to it that, so far as possible, practice should correspond with this ideal. Accordingly, our Lord here lays down the following leading principles, viz.: (1) The law concerning adultery applies to man as well as to woman—indeed, more especially to the former. (2) Marriage is dissolved only by actual fornication; in which case the non-offending party is again free. (3) What constitutes a legal divorcement is not the separation of the two parties,—which, as in morally faulty marriages, may not only be excusable, but perhaps even duty,—but *re-marriage* after separation, and that whether it be a marriage by which the divorced woman is finally abandoned, or else a woman that had been divorced is espoused. Thus far the legal settlement of the question. In practical legislation, it is necessary to keep two points in view, viz.: what constitutes fornication; and the difference between mere separation and the right of entering into another union. With regard to fornication, we must—according to 1 Cor. vii. 15—here include religious, spiritual apostasy. But in reference to the re-marrying of those who have been divorced—except under the above circumstances—we believe that no human tribunal has, as a matter of right, the power of granting such a permission, although (in the opinion of the author) it may be conceded as an act of grace on the part of the reigning sovereign, especially in cases where mitigating circumstances justify such an act of dispensation. (See the author's *Leben Jesu*, ii. 2, 1101; iii. 179; *Posit. Dogmatik*, p. 1215.)

The matrimonial law of the Roman Catholic Church, and the common statute law of Prussia and other Protestant countries of Germany, are instances of the two opposite extremes and aberrations to which a misinterpretation of this passage has given rise. The former starts from the supposition, that actual union, or the solemnizing of matrimony, constitutes of itself and alone an indissoluble marriage. The history of the Middle Ages, the state of society in Italy and in other Roman Catholic countries, especially in South America, furnish a sad illustration of this principle. While the bed in which the stream was to flow has been converted into a hard, stone-built channel, the river has broken through all bounds, and cutting out a channel for itself, winds its way irregularly and wildly through forests and swamps. The false assumption in this case seems to be, that the law of Moses had occupied the lowest stage—that it was the *minimum* of right; not that it embodied a principle, and was intended to prepare the way for realizing the full idea of marriage. In many Protestant countries, on the other hand, the opposite error has been committed; the *legality* of marriage has been thoroughly undermined, and free love substituted in its place as the controlling principle of true marriage. In that case, the writing of divorcement is not, like that of Moses, intended to render separation more difficult, but, like that of Hillel, to make it more easy.

It deserves special notice, that the great reformation here inaugurated by the Lord is introduced by an explanation of the circumstances under which marriage should be avoided. All such cases may be arranged under three classes: those who by their physical constitution are disqualified for such a union; those in which moral and social relations

prevent the carrying out of marriage in its full import; and, lastly, those who, being married, were to subordinate their married relationship to their calling as Christians, and in this respect to renounce it. Thus marriage was to be regenerated on the basis of ideal renunciation.*

[3. DAVID BROWN on ver. 12: "When our Lord holds forth the single life as designed for and suited to certain specific classes, let Christians understand that, while their own plan and condition of life should be regulated by higher considerations than mere inclination or personal advantage, they are not to lay down rules for others, but let each decide for himself, as to his own Master he standeth or falleth. For he that in these things serveth Christ is acceptable to God and approved of men." ALFORD (after NEANDER) on ver. 12: "It is to be observed that our Lord does not here utter a word from which any superiority can be attributed to the state of celibacy: the imperative in the last clause being not a command but a permission, as in Rev. xxii. 17. His estimate for us of the expediency of celibacy, as a general question, is to be gathered from the parable of the talents, where He visits with severe blame the burying of the talent for its safer custody. The remark is Neander's (*Leben Jesu*, p. 584, 4th ed.), and the more valuable, as he himself [and his sister who took care of him] lived and died unmarried."—Christ certainly nowhere commands, or even recommends, voluntary celibacy to any one; the most which can be gathered from the last clause of ver. 12: ὁ δυνάμενος χωρεῖν χωρείτω, in connection with ver. 21, is that He *expected* such a sacrifice from some of His disciples. Comp. de Wette *in loc.*—P. S.]

4. The great object of the Lord in this section is to reinstate woman in her original rights. In the ancient world, as still in heathen countries, woman was treated as a slave. Even among the Jews the right of divorcement was refused to woman, although it was accorded to her by the Roman law. This, however, does not imply that the legislation of Rome occupied higher ground than that of Israel. In the former case, the rights of the free citizen were chiefly guarded; while in Jewish law the idea of the family prevailed. Still, the law of Rome may be said to have prepared the way for Christian legislation on the subject of matrimony.

5. "The creation of one couple may be regarded, (1) As proof that monogamy alone is agreeable to the will of God; which also appears from the fact of the continuance of the same proportion between the male and female sex, even with a numerical advantage on the part of the male sex, which would have been reversed if polygamy had been intended by the Creator. (2) As evidence that this union was to continue unseparated; otherwise, God would have created more than one couple or more wives. In this respect also the order of nature is the order of God." Heubner.

* [The next section of about half a column is omitted in the translation, since it relates exclusively to the intricate marriage difficulties in the Prussian state-church-establishment, taking a middle ground between the rigorous reform party and the conformist majority of pastors. The Prussian laws on marriage, dating from the infidel reign of Frederic II., are scandalously lax and demoralizing, by increasing the causes, and facilitating the accomplishment of divorce. With the revival of true Christianity in Prussia a reform movement commenced, which aims at a return to the law of Christ. The subject has been extensively agitated for the last twenty years by the religious press, on Synods, Pastoral Conferences, and also on the German Church Diet. Comp. a number of articles in HENGSTENBERG'S *Evang. Kirchenzeitung*, for 1840-'60; LIEBETRUT: *Ueber geordnete Entwicklung der Ehe*, Berlin, 1856; and GOESCHEN, article *Ehe* in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopædie*, vol. iii., pp. 666-707.—P. S.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Wherever Christ goes, friends and foes follow Him: 1. As His friends, those who need help; 2. as His enemies, the representatives of slavish legalism and licentious antinomianism.—The doctrine of Christ concerning marriage: 1. Its binding character as instituted by God; 2. its decay in the progress of history; 3. its prepared restoration under the law; 4. its transformation by the gospel.—Marriage an institution of God.—Marriage as completing and consecrating creation—as the basis of the family—as the complete communion of life—a figure of the communion between the Lord and His Church, Eph. v.—How sin has obscured this best and most blessed relationship of life, and frequently perverted it into the most fruitful source of misery.—The writing of divorcement in its different aspects.—How Christianity has elevated woman, and restored her rights.—Genuine and Christian love the great preservative against disturbing influences.—Unchastity always a renunciation of self-respect and of personal dignity,—a dissolution of the holiest of bonds.—Solemnity and earnestness of the marriage relationship.—The threefold renunciation of marriage under the gospel, preparing the way for Christian marriage.—Christ the founder of the Christian family: 1. Of the law regulating marriage; 2. of the law regulating children; 3. of the law regulating property.

Starke:—*Quesnel*: The union of man and wife more close even than that of parents and children, Gen. ii. 24.—*Hedinger*: Husband and wife should be not only one flesh, but also one heart and mind, Eph. v. 31.—The order of marriage is instituted by God Himself; but, alas! many persons enter this state not only without God, but against His mind and will. —*Osiander*: Satan attempts to interpret Scripture through his servants; but he perverts it, and misrepresents its meaning.—*Zeisius*: Under the new dispensation, everything is not sanctioned that was tolerated under the law.—*Piscator*: Celibacy is not a more holy state than marriage.

Gerlach:—In this relationship, man is to show that he has conquered the flesh and nature by the power of the Spirit.

Heubner:—Christ is not determined by the opinions of the scribes; but points back to the original institution as founded by God, which is the source and ground of all further enactments.

B. *Children in the Church.* Ch. XIX. 13–15.

(Mark x. 13–16; Luke xviii. 15–17.)

13 Then were there[1] brought unto him little children, that he should [might] put *his*
14 hands on them, and pray: and the disciples rebuked them. But Jesus said, Suffer
[the, τά] little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me; for of such is[2] the
15 kingdom of heaven. And he laid *his* hands on them, and departed thence.[3]

[1] Ver. 13.—[*There* is an unnecessary interpolation of the E. V.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 14.—[Or: *to such belongeth*, Tyndale, Conant, etc. The Saviour does not say: *αὐτῶν ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν*, *of them*, as in ch. v. 3, 10 (although the children are certainly included), but, extending the blessing: *τῶν τοιούτων ἐστίν*, *of such*, *i. e.*, of all those that have a childlike spirit and are like those little ones *that believe* in Christ, comp. xviii. 2–6. Calvin is right in explaining: *tam parvuli, quam eorum similes.*—P. S.]

[3] Ver. 15.—[The different readings in this section have no effect on the sense, and are omitted by Dr. Lange. I will merely mention them: Ver. 13: *προσηνέχθη—προσηνέχθησαν*; *ἐπετίμησαν—ἐπετίμων*; Ver. 14: *εἶπεν—εἶπεν αὐτοῖς*; *πρός με—πρός ἐμε*; Ver. 15: *αὐτοῖς—ἐπ' αὐτούς*.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 13. **Then were brought to Him little children.**—Forming a glorious contrast to the questions previously propounded. The blessing of children in opposition to marriage offences. [*Little children*, *παιδία*, not only little boys and girls, but also *infants*, or *babes*, as is evident from the term *βρέφη* of Luke xviii. 15.—P. S.]

To Him.—From this history we gather, that in Peræa Christ was not merely regarded as a sacred personage, but that His dignity and character were also in some measure acknowledged.

That He should put His hands on them.—Not merely as a symbol, but also as an act of benediction,—*i. e.*, as effectually conferring some moral blessing. Similarly, it was also expressive of *consecration* and of *healing*, Gen. xlviii. 14; Exod. xxix. 10; 2 Kings iv. 34. Comp. the article *Handauflegung* in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopædie*. Hebrew mothers would be accustomed to seek in this manner a blessing for their children. The presidents of synagogues were also in the habit of putting their hands on children.

The disciples rebuked them.—According to Mark, those who brought them; and Meyer suggests that the term *προσηνέχθη* indicates that the word *αὐτοῖς* in the text refers to these persons. But in our view the Evangelist intends to indicate, that while the rebuke was addressed to those who brought the children, it was in reality directed toward the children themselves. Accordingly, our Lord replies, *Suffer little children*, etc.

Ver. 14. **Of such is the kingdom of heaven.**—Various views are entertained of this passage: 1. Bengel and de Wette apply it to children in the literal sense. 2. Meyer interprets it of persons of a childlike disposition, ch. xviii. 3. Calvin remarks: *tam parvuli, quam eorum similes.* 4. The Church commonly applies it to the institution of infant baptism, explaining it as meaning, children which are offered to the Lord, and come to Him. Hence, such as are dedicated unto God in baptism,—the children of the theocracy as the generation which embodied the hope of the kingdom of heaven. But according to the parallel passages in Mark and Luke, it must also be regarded as a symbol of a childlike spirit, just as baptism itself is the type of personal regeneration.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. This section may be regarded as shedding a precious light on that which preceded. The blessing of having children, and presenting them to the Lord, seems to banish the sorrows and miseries which the disciples had anticipated.

2. The believers in Peræa appear to have been sufficiently advanced in spiritual knowledge to understand that Christ was able to bless even little children (*βρέφη*, according to Luke), and that they were capable of receiving a blessing. But in this instance the disciples seem to have displayed a less liberal spirit—we should almost say, that they were inclined to Baptistic rigorism. They regarded the request of these parents as an unseasonable interruption of a most important discussion, and as a premature step on their part. But while rebuking the ignorant zeal of His disciples, the Saviour returned a gracious answer to the humble aspirations of these mothers in Israel, and at the same time fully met the unconscious wants of their children.

3. *Of such is the kingdom of heaven.*—The ancient Church has rightly regarded this passage as a proof in favor of the doctrine of infant baptism. Our Lord here distinctly states—1. that little children are capable of receiving a blessing from His hands; 2. that this blessing refers to the kingdom of heaven, and their entrance into it; 3. He shows that it is accompanied by, and may be conveyed along with, a symbolical action. Baptists are apt to ignore the possibility of faith as a seed in the heart of infants, just as they fail to perceive the full idea of the Christian family, and of the blessing which may descend from Christian parentage. On the other hand, our Lord evidently includes children among those that are called into His kingdom, and who are intended to share the blessing of the Christian family. *See* also our notes on ch. x. 12–14 (p. 187).

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Children God's blessing on the married relationship.—How the happiness of children counterbalances the misery of marriage.*—How marriage should be

* [Much better in German: *Wie der Kinderjubel den Ehejammer übertönt*, lit.: "How the jubilation of children outsounds (silences) the lamentation of marriage." The Edinb. trsl. omits this and similar sentences altogether.]

sanctified even by a regard to the children.—Children are to be brought to the Lord.—Children are capable of receiving a blessing.—The attempt to debar children from Christ rebuked and resisted by the Lord.—The children of believers are admitted into the kingdom of heaven.—"*Suffer little children*."—Children and the kingdom of heaven in their mutual relationship: 1. Every new generation of children becoming fairer in the kingdom of heaven; 2. the kingdom of heaven shines forth more beautifully in every new generation of believers.—Or, 1. The kingdom of heaven belongs to children; 2. children belong to the kingdom of heaven.

Starke:—*Quesnel:* Let us entreat the blessing of the Lord upon our children.—[Heaven is for the humble and simple.—] *Osiander:* Let parents see to it that they do everything which may contribute to the salvation of their children.—*Bibl. Würt.:* If the kingdom of heaven belongs to children, then also faith and baptism.

Gossner:—What is great before the world, is little before Christ, and what the world despises, is elected by Christ.

Lisco:—Children are specially susceptible of spiritual influences. In their case there is still—1. confidence, instead of scepticism; 2. self-surrender, instead of distrust; 3. truth, instead of hypocrisy; 4. modesty and humility, instead of pride.

Heubner:—Faith in the power and in the efficacy of the prayers of holy men: 1. On what it is based; 2. its conditions.—Let us impress it on the minds of children, that Christ claims them as His own.—The rebuke of the disciples an admonition to those who object to the early religious instruction of children.—Jesus the model of pure and holy love of children.—Natural and Christian affection for children.

C. *Property in the Church.* CH. XIX. 16–26.

(Mark x. 17–27; Luke xviii. 18–27.)

16 And, behold, one came and said unto him,[1] Good[2] Master, what good thing [τί ἀγα-
17 θόν] shall I do, that I may have eternal life? And he said unto him, Why callest thou
me good? *there is* none good but one, *that is*, God [Why doest thou ask me about the
good? One is the Good, ὁ ἀγαθός][3]: but if thou wilt enter into life, keep the com-
18 mandments. He saith unto him, Which? Jesus said, Thou shalt do no murder [shalt
not kill], Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear
19 false witness, Honour thy father and *thy* mother: and, Thou shalt love thy neighbour
20 as thyself. The young man saith unto him, All these things have I kept from my
21 youth up[4]: what lack I yet [do I yet lack]? Jesus said unto him, If thou wilt be per-
fect, go *and* sell that [what] thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have trea-
22 sure in heaven: and come *and* follow me. But when the young man heard that saying,
he went away sorrowful: for he had great possessions.
23 Then said Jesus unto his disciples, Verily I say unto you, That a rich man shall
24 hardly enter into the kingdom of heaven. And again I say unto you, It is easier for a
camel to go through[5] the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom
25 of God. When his disciples heard *it*, they were exceedingly amazed, saying, Who
26 then can be saved? But Jesus beheld *them*, and said unto them, With men this is im-
possible; but with God all things are possible.

[1] Ver. 16.—[Or better: *one came to him and said*, εἷς προσελθὼν αὐτῷ εἶπεν, which is the correct reading for εἶπεν αὐτῷ.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 16.—Codd. B., D., L., al., [also Cod. Sinait.], omit ἀγαθέ (*good*), and read only διδάσκαλε (*master, teacher*). With this is connected the following reading: τί με ἐρωτᾷς περὶ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ; εἷς ἐστιν ὁ ἀγαθός (instead of the *Recepta:* τί με λέγεις, κ.τ.λ.). These readings are decidedly better attested by B., D., and ancient versions, and adopted by Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf. The *Recepta* is inserted from Mark and Luke.

[3] Ver. 17.—[The true reading, as already stated by Dr. Lange in the preceding note, is: τί με ἐρωτᾷς περὶ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ; εἷς ἐστιν ὁ ἀγαθός, *i. e.*, *Why doest thou ask me about the good? One is the* [absolutely] *Good;* Lange: *Was fragst du mich über das Gute? Einer ist der Gute.* This reading is sustained by Cod. Sinait., Cod. Vatican., D., L., and other MSS., by Origen, Euseb., Jerome, Augustine, the Latin Vulgate ("*Quid me interrogas de bono? unus est bonus, Deus*"), and other ancient versions, and adopted by Tregelles and Alford, as well as Lachmann and Tischendorf. *See* the summaries in the editions of these critics *in loc.* The *lect. rec.:* τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν; οὐδεὶς ἀγαθὸς, εἰ μὴ εἷς, ὁ θεός, is from Mark and Luke, and is an answer to the *address:* "*Good* Master," while Matthew gives the answer to the *question* of the young man: "*What good thing shall I do?*" Our Lord referred him first from the multiplicity of good things (τὰ ἀγαθά) to the unity of the absolute personal Good (ὁ ἀγαθός) or God (this is the sense of the question in Matthew), and then He directed him (in the question of Mark and Luke) from a merely humanitarian view of Christ to the true theanthropic view, as if to say: If God alone is good, why do you call *Me* good, whom you regard a mere Rabbi? He answered to the *thoughts* of the young man and declined his relative and humanitarian homage, but pointed him at the same time to the higher and absolute conception of good, in which He was good according to His divine nature and as one in essence with the Father. He does not say: "*I* am not good," but "*none* is good;" no man is good in the proper sense of the term, but God alone.—P. S.]

[4] Ver. 20.—[The words: ἐκ νεότητός μου, *from my youth up*, are omitted in the best ancient authorities, including Cod. Sinait., and in the modern critical editions. (*See* the apparatus in Lachmann, Tischendorf, Alford.) They are inserted from the parallel passages of Mark and Luke. Dr. Lange retains them in his German Version.—P. S.]

[5] Ver. 24.—Besides the reading: διελθεῖν, we have the more difficult εἰσελθεῖν, *to go into.* [Cod. Sinait. reads: εισελθιν.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 16. **And, behold, one came,** εἷς.—From the circumstance that the former two sections are connected together, we infer that Christ was still surrounded by the Pharisees who had come tempting Him. Hence the expression of astonishment: "Behold!" Besides, the special designation of this "one" as an ἄρχων in the Gospel by Luke, is in favor of the supposition that, having partly been gained over by Jesus, he now came forward with the inquiry of the text.

Vers. 16, 17. **(Good) Master.**—We presuppose that the accounts of Mark and Luke must be regarded as supplementing that of Matthew. In that case, the rejoinder of the Saviour: "*Why callest thou Me good?*" must be taken as an objection, not to this salutation itself, but to the superficial and merely outward meaning which attached to it in the mind of this scribe. None is good but God: One only is good. Everything good being in and from Him, can only be one, and can only be regarded as good in so far as it is connected with God.

Thus we also account for the reading: "*Why askest thou Me about the good? One is the Good.*" God alone being good, is the sole source of all goodness. Hence the duty of doing good is not one of many others which has to be ascertained by means of inquiry, or by theological investigation. The one good thing is to live in God and to love God. Of this the commencement is to keep the commandments, which are the legal form in which that which is good has manifested itself. In other words, seek to fulfil the law, or to be righteous before God. When attempting to do this, you will gradually be led onward to repentance and faith; or, in order to arrive at the *one good*, or to come unto God, you must first *be in earnest about His commandments*, or the manifold forms under which the good becomes outwardly manifest. Neander is mistaken in interpreting the passage: "Why askest thou *Me* about that which is good? One is good; address thyself *to Him.* He has revealed it in His word." Still more erroneous is the view of de Wette, who explains it as meaning: Why propoundest thou to Me the unanswerable inquiry about the real and highest good? etc. It is certainly strange, that while this critic characterizes such an inquiry as unanswerable, Meyer should style it superfluous. The latter interpreter, however, aptly remarks: "There is one *who* is good, and one *that* is good, *alterum non datur.* But if you really wish (the δέ here in the same sense as the metabatic *autem*) to apply to your life what I say, so as to become thoroughly conscious of its spiritual import, etc." The emphasis rests on the words: τί με ἐρωτᾷς. That which is good is not to be treated as the subject of pharisaical ἐρωτᾶν. It is not to be found in the form of any particular commandment contained among Jewish traditions. Hence Fritzsche correctly explains τί ἀγαθὸν ποιήσω by *quid quod bonum sit, what good thing.* The young man imagined that he had kept all these things; yet he felt that he still lacked something, although he knew not what. Thus the transaction here recorded is closely connected with the interview between Jesus and the scribe recorded in Mark xii. 28. In that case the fundamental idea was: One God; and hence, only one commandment. In the present instance: Only one good Being; and hence, also, only one good thing. On both occasions, the Lord alludes to the contrast with Jewish traditionalism and its manifold ordinances, which so frequently impeded and obscured what was good.

Ver. 18. **Which?**—Ποίας, "*quales*, which is not equivalent to τίνας, but implies that he would like to know its characteristic marks." Meyer. Hence the statement shows that, like the Pharisees generally, he made a distinction between what were supposed to be primary and secondary commandments.

Thou shalt not.—This enumeration of the commandments by the Lord is of some importance, with reference to the distinction between what are commonly termed the first and second tables of the law. In ver. 18 four commandments of the second table are mentioned; and it has been asked how this verse stands related to ver. 19. But, according to Lev. xix. 18, the injunction, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," is evidently intended as a summary of the second table. Hence we infer that "Honor thy father and thy mother" is to be taken in a deeper sense, as summing up the commandments of the first table. In other words, 1. Keep sacred the root of life; or, the first table. 2. Keep sacred the tree of which you are a branch; or, the second table

Ver. 20. **All these things have I kept,** etc.: **what do I yet lack?** τί ἔτι ὑστερῶ;—The latter query must not be regarded as an expression of satisfied self-righteousness, as if it implied, In that case I lack nothing. It is, indeed, true that the young man was still self-righteous. He had no conception of the spirituality, the depth, or the height of the commandments of God. Taking only the letter of the law, he considered himself blameless, and perhaps even righteous, before God. Yet his heart misgave him, and he felt that he still lacked something. Under this sense of want, he put the question to the Saviour, as if he would have said: What is it then that I yet lack? All these things have not given me peace of mind. That such is the correct view of the passage, appears both from the statement in Mark, "*Then Jesus, beholding him, loved him,*" and from the great struggle through which he afterward passed.

Ver. 21. **If thou wilt be perfect.**—In its connection with the preceding context, the expression can only mean: If thou wilt have the one good thing, and thus do the one good thing, so that spiritual fear and want may give place to peace and love, etc. The Lord admits the supposition of the young man, that he was now beyond the *many* commandments, or the way of the law. Well, then, granting this to be the case, proceed to the *one thing.* The young man was now to give proof that he was in earnest about the matter. For this purpose Jesus tries him, with the view of setting before him the deeper import of the law, and of awakening within him a sense of sinfulness and of spiritual bondage. The injunction of the Lord is manifestly intended to bring out the fact, that the young man had made an idol of his riches, and hence that he utterly contravened the spirit even of the first commandment. Substantially, this demand of Christ imports the same thing as the call addressed to all His disciples—to deny themselves, to take up the cross, and to follow Him. In this sense, then, the injunction applies to every Christian. All that belongs to a believer is in reality not his, but the Lord's property; above all, it belongs *Christo in pauperibus.* The Lord, however, expresses this general call of His

gospel, as it were, in a legal form, for the purpose of taking away the self-righteousness of the young man, and of leading him to feel his sinfulness and need of salvation. Obviously He could not have meant, that by literally and outwardly obeying this injunction, the young man would obtain a claim upon the kingdom of heaven. Hence those interpreters have missed the import of the passage, who imagine that everything would have been right if the young man had only followed the direction of the Saviour; but that, as he went away sorrowful, he was finally lost. It is, indeed, true that his going away indicated a state of great danger, and was calculated to awaken serious concern about his future. Still the fact of his being *sorrowful* afforded evidence of an inward conflict, through which by grace he might pass to a proper view of his state before God. This was still lacking in his case, and not any additional attempt at external righteousness.

Treasure in heaven.—Comp. v. 12; vi. 20.

Ver. 23. **Hardly,** δυσκόλως.—The expression implies that the state of the young man was one of extreme danger. Still it does not follow that it was hopeless. A rich man may enter into the kingdom of heaven, although not *as* a rich man. The difficulty of the case lies in the natural unwillingness to surrender our trust in and love of earthly possessions. Comp. the tract of Clement of Alexandria: Τίς ὁ σωζόμενος πλούσιος; *Quis dives salvetur?*

Ver. 24. **It is easier for a camel.**—The hyperbolical figure here used has given rise to various false interpretations. Thus, 1. it has been rendered an anchor-rope, (*a*) after the somewhat arbitrary interpretation of the word κάμηλος (τινές in Theophylact); or, (*b*) after the reading κάμιλον* (Castellio, Huetius, etc.). 2. It has been asserted that the expression, *eye of a needle*, was in the East used to designate the side-gate for foot-passengers, close by the principal gate, through which camels were wont to enter cities. 3. Most interpreters, however, have taken the terms, "*camel*" and "*the eye of a needle*," in their literal sense. Thus Grotius remarks: *totum hoc proverbium mutata cameli voce in elephantem est apud Rabbi Jacobum in Caphtor.* Similarly de Wette reminds us that the same saying occurs in the Talmud about an elephant; comp. Lightfoot, Schöttgen, Buxtorf's *Lexic. Talmud.*†. Grotius quotes a similar Latin proverb, and refers to Jer. xiii. 23 as a somewhat analogous passage. It seems to us that the Saviour here intended to convey the fact, that the difficulty of entering into the kingdom of heaven, to which ver. 23 referred, had now become changed into an impossibility. Of course, no expression could be too strong to characterize an impossibility. Hence the import of the passage seems to be, that while ver. 23 refers to those who actually possessed riches, with which they might at any moment part, ver. 24 applies to rich men in the symbolical sense of the term, or to those who give their heart and life to these things. Accordingly, we regard the expression not merely as a proverbial saying, but as intended to express that a thing was absolutely impossible. The camel as a beast of burden might serve as a fit emblem of a rich person; while the eye of a needle, which is the smallest passage through which anything visible could enter, might be regarded as a figure of the spiritual entrance into the kingdom, of a soul which had renounced the world. In one respect, however, even this figure is inadequate, if taken literally, as it might imply that a soul could enter that kingdom while hanging to the world, though it were only by a thread. But figures must not be too closely pressed, and the eye of a needle is certainly the most fitting emblem that could be found.

Ver. 25. **Who then can be saved?**—De Wette (after Grotius): "Since every one has more or less of the same love of the world." This explanation is certainly more satisfactory than that of Meyer, who regards the clause as a *conclusio a majoribus ad minores;* as if it meant, If rich persons, who have the means of doing so much good, have such difficulty, who then, etc.? In our view, the disciples reasoned as follows: If riches render a man unfit for the kingdom of heaven, there is surely some thread of possessions by which even the poorest individual may be kept from entering the kingdom, more especially as by nature every one loves riches. Or, perhaps, we might take it even in a more general sense: If riches are so great a hindrance, how much more actual sin! The disciples had evidently not yet fully perceived that every sin springs from worldliness of mind and heart; and their Jewish prejudices rose in rebellion against this teaching.

Ver. 26. **But Jesus looking on them.**—With kindly sympathy. He felt what a hard struggle they had yet before them, before they could attain the full liberty of the children of God.

With men.—The use of the plural number deserves notice: 1. According to the judgment of men. So Fritzsche and Ewald. 2. According to the power and ability of men. De Wette and Meyer. Both these views may be combined. The common judgment of men accords, in this instance, with their felt inability; and in that sense it is impossible. But God, in His power and grace, not only renders this possible, but actually declares it such, in and through Christ. The expression *men* refers to the ancient and corrupt world, lost in its worldliness; while the Lord is here presented to the view of the disciples as the Creator of a new era, in which the world would be crucified to believers, and they to the world. Comp. Luke i. 37.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. We have already stated that this section sets before us the third aspect of the Christian family, or of the family in the kingdom of heaven. Having first shown what is the import of Christian marriage, and then assigned to children their proper place in the Christian household, the Lord now refers to the possessions of believers. *It is of great importance to notice the threefold offence of the disciples in regard to the three fundamental elements in the Christian family, and the manner in which the Lord removes these offences.* As the young man was still entirely

* [The word κάμιλος, supposed to mean a *rope* or *cable*, occurs in a few minuscule MSS., but in no Greek author, and was probably invented to escape the imaginary difficulty of this proverbial expression. Comp. the Greek Lexica and the apparatus in Tischendorf's large edition *ad ver.* 24.—P. S.]

† [The *Koran*, Sur. vii. 38, probably in imitation of this passage, uses the same figure: "*Non ingredientur paradisum, donec transeat camelus foramen acus.*" Comp. also Matt. xxiii. 24, *to swallow a camel.* The camel was more familiar to the hearers of the Saviour than the elephant, and on account of the hump on its back, it was especially adapted to symbolize earthly wealth as a heavy load and serious impediment to entrance through the narrow gate of the kingdom of heaven.—P. S.]

legalistic in his views, Christ sets before him in a legalistic form the great principle according to which a Christian man was to administer his property. But this mode of teaching was intended to awaken the "ruler" to a knowledge of his real state before God. Hence it is a complete perversion of the import of the passage, when Roman Catholic divines regard it as a commandment applying to special individuals, or as what they designate a *consilium evangelicum*, in reference to voluntary poverty. The supposed *consilium* only becomes *evangelicum*, and in that case a *principium evangelicum*, when we look beyond the form in which this principle is expressed, and learn to regard it as teaching that a Christian is to consider all his possessions as a trust committed to him by the Lord, which he is to employ for behoof of the poor, or for the removal of the wants of humanity.

2. In this passage, the doctrine concerning the highest good is expressed in most clear and definite language. God is not merely the highest good, but also the source of all moral and physical good, and hence the only good. Even Christ Himself only claims the designation of Good because He is one with the Father, not because He was the "leading Rabbi." And just as any creature can only be called good from its connection with God, so all the special commandments are only an expression of moral good in so far as they are viewed in their connection with the fundamental commandment of love to God. Finally, physical good is such only, if enjoyed or administered in the spirit of Christian devotion; otherwise it becomes a snare to the soul, and an evil instead of a blessing.

3. The Lord at once perceived that, both in respect of virtue and of the things of this life, the young man had lost sight of God as the highest and only good; and that when he addressed Him as "Good Master," it had not been from the depth of a believing heart, but only as a worldly and superficial acknowledgment of His character. This view is corroborated by the peculiar manner in which the Lord dealt with him, the object of which, evidently, was to bring him to proper knowledge—to a knowledge of Christ, to an understanding of the commandments, to a proper view of the import of earthly blessings, but above all to a sight and sense of his own state and condition. Many commentators labor under a twofold misapprehension in interpreting this narrative. First, they confound the mental self-righteousness or intellectual legalism of the young man with self-righteousness of the heart, entirely overlooking the fact, that he expresses a deep feeling of spiritual want. It is in this sense that we understand the statement of Mark, that Jesus, beholding him, loved him. True, his heart was not yet broken under a sense of spiritual poverty; he still deceived himself, in his self-righteousness; but he felt that there remained some deep want unsatisfied. Again, the young man is generally condemned and supposed to have been ultimately lost, because he did not immediately obey the injunction of Christ; as if the Lord had intended to convert him into a legalist, instead of arousing him to a sense of his guilt and sinfulness. [Similarly ALFORD: "This young man, though self-righteous, was no *hypocrite*, no Pharisee: he spoke earnestly, and really strove to keep, as he really believed he had kept, all God's commandments. Accordingly Mark adds, that Jesus looking upon him *loved him:* in spite of his error there was a nobleness and openness about him, contrasted with the hypocritical bearing of the Pharisees and scribes."—P. S.]

4. "Such an animal as a camel, laden with its burdens, could not possibly enter the gate of a city of dwarfs, so small as to be compared to the eye of a needle. The case of a rich man is exactly similar. Naturally overgrown and laden with burdens, the rich man whose heart cleaves to his wealth appears before the strait gate of the kingdom of heaven. No wonder that in these circumstances he cannot even see, far less enter it. He still belongs to the sensual world; the only things which he can perceive are outward and carnal objects. The kingdom of heaven, with its spiritual realities, is far too small and inconsiderable to attract his sensuous gaze, nor can he in that state enter into it." (From the author's *Leben Jesu*, ii. 2, 2110.)

5. Our Lord here presents one great truth under a twofold aspect: (1) It is difficult for any rich man to enter into the kingdom of heaven, because it is difficult for him to become poor. (2) It is even impossible for him, inasmuch as he is rich, and will remain such, unless by a miracle of grace he becomes poor in spirit. Hence the disciples asked in deep concern, Who then can be saved? They felt that the saying of the Lord applied to the poor as well as to the rich, since all aimed after wealth; nay, that it applied to themselves, as they also still placed too much value on earthly things. Hence Jesus now "beheld" them with the same look of pity and sympathy as formerly the young man. True, it is impossible with men; but all things are possible with God, who can and will empty His own people, and make them poor. Thus are we, by a miracle of grace and through the cross, to be so directed and influenced, that we possess as if we possessed not, and that, as heirs of God, or of the highest good, we shall be willing to lay on the altar of love all which we possess.

6. "The application of this passage made by the begging monastic orders—Francis of Assisi—is not the right one." Heubner. [This application is much older than the mendicant orders of the middle ages. St. Antony of Egypt, the patriarch of Christian monks, when he heard this Scripture lesson in the church, understood the Saviour's injunction, ver. 21, in a literal sense, and sold his rich possessions, retaining only a sufficiency for the support of his sister. When shortly afterward he heard the Gospel: *Take no thought of the following morning*, he sold the remainder and gave it to the poor. The Roman Catholic commentators and moralists base their doctrine of voluntary poverty as an essential element of the higher Christian perfection mainly on this passage. Comp. Maldonatus, Cornelius à Lapide, and Schegg *in loc.* But Christ commands *all* His disciples to be perfect, τέλειοι, ch. v. 48, and so St. Paul, 1 Cor. ii. 6; Phil. iii. 15; Col. i. 20; Eph. iv. 13; and St. James i. 4; iii. 2. The counsel, therefore, must be understood in a sense in which it is applicable to all true believers.—P. S.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The good as viewed in the light of the gospel.—Property in the Christian family.—God the highest and sole good, and the source of every other good.—The character of Christians: 1. They give themselves to that which is good; 2. they do that which is

good; 3. they hold their possessions for that which is good. Or, the principle—1. of all virtue; 2. of all duty; 3. of all true riches.—The inquiry of the rich young man: "What good thing must I do?" as expressing a threefold error: 1. He seems to think that he can be saved by his works; 2. by deeds of special beneficence; 3. by some particular deed, which was to crown and complete all his previous righteousness.—A ruler of the synagogue, and yet he has no conception of the law in its spirituality; or, the fearful ignorance resulting from mere legalism.—Self-deception and self-righteousness producing each other.—The question of the young man should have been: How may I have eternal life in order to do good things?—The various forms of self-righteousness: 1. Self-righteousness of the head and of the heart (of doctrine and of sentiment); or, Pharisees in the strictest sense; 2. self-righteousness of the heart with orthodoxy of the head, as in the case of some in the Church who seem to be zealous for soundness of doctrine; 3. self-righteousness of the head, combined with a deep sense of spiritual need, although its grounds may not be fully understood, as in the case of this young man and of many Christian legalists.—Antagonism between the self-delusion of a man and the felt need of his heart.—"If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments;" or, we can only be free from the law by the law: 1. By understanding its spiritual import (its application to the heart); 2. by comprehending all the commandments into one commandment (forming, as it were, the point of the arrow of the law); 3. by sincere and earnest self-examination, in view of the one great commandment of love to God (the law working death).—How the Lord applies the law in order to train us for the gospel.—The rich young man in the school of the Lord.—On the close connection between spiritual and temporal riches (or rather, the attempt to be rich): 1. Spiritual riches leading to pride and pretensions; 2. temporal riches often serving to conceal spiritual poverty.—The dangers of riches (avarice, love of pleasure, pride, confidence in temporal wealth, false spirituality, self-deception as to our spiritual state).—The object of riches.—Twofold interpretation of this declaration of the Lord: 1. The interpretation put upon it by the disciples; 2. the interpretation of the Master.—"Who then can be saved?" or, an admission that all men share the same guilt and love of the world.—How a rich man may enter into the kingdom of heaven: 1. It is always difficult in his peculiar circumstances; 2. it is impossible, if in mind and heart he cleaves to his wealth (the Pharisees); 3. it becomes possible by a miracle of divine grace (Joseph of Arimathea).—The entrance into the kingdom of heaven: 1. Very inaccessible to the natural man: (*a*) it is always, and in every case, a strait gate; (*b*) it becomes the eye of a needle to those who are rich. 2. But it is widely open to believers: (*a*) leading the genuine disciple of Christ into the banqueting-hall, Matt. xxv. 10; (*b*) it is a gate of honor to faithful followers of Christ; (*c*) a heavenly gate on our return to the Father's house, John xiv. 2.—The various stages of evil, as represented by the symbols of a "camel," "wolves," and a "generation of vipers."—The camel with its heavy burden before the eye of a needle, an emblem of avarice or of worldly-mindedness standing at the gate of heaven. Comp. Matt. xxiii. 24.—Regeneration and poverty in spirit a miracle of grace; resembling in that respect the birth of Christ, Luke i. 37.

Starke:—*Quesnel:* If we want to know how we may be saved, let us apply to Christ, the greatest and truest Teacher.—*Zeisius:* It is a common but most dangerous error, to seek eternal life by our own works.—Every good gift cometh from above, James i. 17. To arrogate it to ourselves, is not only to defile the gift by touching it with polluted hands, but to be guilty of sacrilege, ch. vii. 22.—*Osiander:* All who are ignorant of their state before God, should be directed to the law in order to learn their guilt and need.—Love to our neighbor the clearest evidence of love to God.—How many imagine that they have done everything required at their hand, while in truth they cannot answer one upon a thousand! Job ix. 3.—*Zeisius:* The law is spiritual; hence, they who trust in their works grievously deceive themselves, Rom. vii. 8, 14.—The most dangerous state, is to imagine that we are righteous in the sight of God.—*Tossani Bibl.:* We are not to take this history as if it implied that by the outward work of almsgiving, the young man would have become perfect. The opposite of this appears from 1 Cor. xiii. 3. But Christ here sets one special commandment before the young man, whose state of mind He well perceived, in order to convince him that he was infinitely far from perfection, and unable to keep the law.—He who soweth bountifully shall also reap bountifully, 2 Cor. ix. 6, 7.—The whole work of salvation is far beyond the knowledge or power of man.—*Quesnel:* A sense of spiritual inability should not lead us to despair, but result in the triumph of the grace of Jesus Christ.

Lisco:—Marginal note of Luther: Our Lord here puts the question, Why callest thou Me good? in the same sense as He says, John vii. 15, My doctrine is not Mine,—referring more particularly to His humanity, by which He would always lead us to the Father.—To be perfect, is to keep the commandments of God.—Hence it is evident, that this young man had not in *reality* observed the commandments, as he fondly imagined.

Gerlach:—Jesus tries the young man by setting before him the spiritual bearing of the law.—By such examples, the Master gradually trained His disciples to understand the utter inability of man for anything that is good.

Heubner:—The "ruler" came forward in haste, as if he could not wait or delay; still it led to no lasting results. Afterward, however, he went away slowly and sorrowfully.—"*There is none good.*" These words are not spoken lightly, but have a deep and most solemn meaning.—Comp. the excellent work of J. Casp. Schade: "*The most important inquiries: What lack I yet? and, What shall I do, that I may have eternal life?*" 14th ed., Leipz., 1734.—The calculation is correct, except in one little particular; but this renders the whole account false.—Every one of us has something which he must give up in order to enter the kingdom of Christ.—*Chrysostom:* On the question of the disciples, "Who then can be saved?"—because they felt concern for the salvation of their fellow-men, because they bore deep affection to them, and because they already felt the tenderness characteristic of all true ministers. This saying of Christ made them tremble for the whole world.

FOURTH SECTION.

THE FUTURE KINGLY MANIFESTATION OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER XIX. 27–XX. 16.

CONTENTS:—(*a*) The glorious reward awaiting the Apostles, and all who renounce the things that are seen, for the sake of Christ, vers. 27–30. (*b*) The reward of free grace; or, the parable of the laborers in the vineyard, ch. xx. 1-16.

Historical Succession.—Immediately after the transaction with the rich young man, Peter put the question as to the reward which awaited the disciples, who had renounced all things and followed Jesus. The reply of the Lord is followed, and further illustrated, by the parable of the laborers in the vineyard.

A. *The glorious reward awaiting the Apostles, and, in general, all who renounce the things that are seen and temporal.* CH. XIX. 27–30.

(Mark x. 28–31; Luke xviii. 28–30).

27 Then answered Peter and said unto him, Behold, we have forsaken all, and follow-
28 ed thee; what shall we have therefore? And Jesus said unto them, Verily I say unto
you, That ye which [who] have followed me, in the regeneration [renovation, παλιγγενεσίᾳ] when the Son of man shall sit in [on] the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit
29 upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel. And every one that hath
forsaken houses, or brethren [brothers], or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife,[1] or children, or lands, for my name's sake, shall receive a hundredfold [manifold],[2] and shall
30 inherit everlasting life. But many *that are* first shall be last; and the last *shall be*
first.[3]

[1] Ver. 29.—The words ἢ γυναῖκα, *or wife*, are omitted in B., D., and many other authorities [and in the critical editions of Lachmann, Tischendorf, Alford.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 29.—B., L., [and the critical editions] read, as in Luke xviii. 30: πολλαπλασίονα, *many times more*, for ἑκατονταπλασίονα, *a hundred times more*, as Mark has it.

[3] Ver. 30.—[Literally: *But many first shall be last, and last first*, πολλοὶ δὲ ἔσονται πρῶτοι ἔσχατοι, καὶ ἔσχατοι πρῶτοι. Comp. the *Exeg. Notes.*—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 27. **Then answered Peter.**—De Wette remarks: The question of Peter was evidently occasioned by the demand which the Lord had addressed to the young man. Meyer expresses the same idea, and adds, that the word ἡμεῖς is put forward by way of emphasis, and in contrast to the conduct of the rich young man. De Wette suggests, "that Peter must have expected some material equivalent; otherwise he would not have put this question, but have been satisfied with the inward and spiritual comfort enjoyed by all disciples" (but comp. 1 Cor. xv. 19). We admit that there was a slight trace of a mercenary spirit in this inquiry. This appears both from ver. 30, and from the parable which immediately follows. Still, the admixture of selfishness was not such as wholly to obscure the higher import and truth of the question itself. In fact, although the inquiry of Peter was in reference to a reward, it was couched in the most diffident and humble language: τί ἄρα ἔσται ἡμῖν; *What then shall we have?* as the Vulgate: *Quid ergo erit nobis?* But Paulus is mistaken in interpreting the meaning of the clause: What then shall we have, viz., to do? Similarly, we cannot agree with Olshausen in paraphrasing it: What shall be our portion? Wilt Thou pronounce the same sentence upon us as upon this young man? The expression ἡμεῖς is evidently intended by way of antithesis to the rich man who could not enter the kingdom of heaven; while the statement, "*Behold, we have forsaken all,*" is meant as a renewed formal renunciation of the world, combined in this case with the timid question (which is not even recorded in the Gospels of Mark and Luke): What then? What shall we have?

We have forsaken all.—De Wette and Meyer regard these words as implying that they no longer occasionally returned to their homes and trades. But even if this idea were not inconsistent with John xxi. 3, it would evidently form only a very secondary consideration. The main point lies in the fact, that when leaving Galilee, they had, in mind and heart, and to the best of their understanding, made a complete renunciation of the world, and were now ready to follow their Lord, on His path of suffering, to Jerusalem. Jesus had already predicted His own future glory, but as yet He had preserved silence about the future of the disciples. On this point they now asked for further information.

Ver. 28. **And Jesus said to them.**—Ver. 28

embodies the special promise to the Apostles; ver. 29, the general statement in reference to all the followers of Christ; while ver. 30, and the parable which follows, express the condition of both these promises.

Ye who have followed Me.—The circumstance that twelve thrones are promised, proves that this address was directed to the Apostles.—**In the renovation,** *παλιγγενεσία*,—the complete Christian regeneration, being the restoration of this world of ours, or the appearance of the new æon, the great *ἐπιφάνεια*, in contradistinction to the commencement of the regeneration—its root and principle (the *ἄνωθεν γεννηθῆναι*, John iii. 3, or the *ἀναγεννηθῆναι*, 1 Pet. i. 3)—which formed the basis of the complete restoration. In point of fact, it coincides with the *ἀποκατάστασις*, Acts iii. 21, although the two ideas are different.* The expression, *λουτρὸν παλιγγενεσίας*, in Tit. iii. 5, seems to comprehend the two ideas of regeneration in principle and complete renovation, and also to point forward from the one to the other. Hilary applies the expression to the first regeneration, and, connecting with it the words, *ἀκολουθήσαντές μοι*, renders it: "Ye who have followed Me in the regeneration, or as regenerated persons." Similarly, Hammond, Fischer, etc., understand it as referring to the first regeneration, and appeal in proof to Tit. iii. 5. Augustine, Theophylact, and Euthymius Zigab. refer it to the resurrection of the body, Fritzsche more particularly to the final judgment. De Wette and Meyer (after Buxtorf's *Lexicon Talmud.* חדוש העולם, Berthold's *Christologie*) apply it "to the renovation of the world, which had been ruined and destroyed by the fall," or to "the restoration of the whole universe to its original state of perfection before the fall." Hence it would nearly correspond with the *ἀποκατάστασις* (de Wette, comp. Joseph. *Antiq.* xi. 3, 8, *ἀποκατάστασις*; § 9, *ἡ παλιγγενεσία τῆς πατρίδος*). But while the latter term refers more particularly to the restoration of the original state of things, according to the promise of God, or to the full renewal and recovery of our diseased, disordered, and decaying world, the expression *παλιγγενεσία* goes beyond this, and points to the further development and advance of the life of man from its original state of terrestrial perfectness to a higher state of spiritual existence (*see* 1 Cor. xv.). At the same time, it is also important to bear in mind that the first "regeneration," in principle, contains the second, and that it is continuously carried on and developed until the final stage shall be attained. Hence, although the Lord here primarily referred to the final completion of the kingdom of heaven, His statement also applies to the glory awaiting the Apostles after death in the kingdom of Christ, and to their spiritual supremacy in Him even while on earth, as well as to the gradual increase in spiritual fellowship with their glorified Master. (Comp. *Exeg. Notes* on ch. xvi. 28.)

When the Son of Man shall sit.—This clause explains more fully the import of the palingenesia. —**On the throne of His glory.**—The *δόξα* is the glory of His appearing when His spiritual power shall become fully manifest. Hence the expression does not simply mean, "the throne on which the Master shall reveal Himself in His glory," but also, "the throne which is the result as well as the manifestation of His glory." This throne, which He occupies as conqueror, ruler, judge, and master, constitutes, so to speak, the centre and the main attribute of His spiritual glory, when fully unfolded. (Comp. Matt. xxv. 31.)

Ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones.—The number of the Apostles is here summed up as twelve, corresponding to that of the tribes of Israel. Accordingly, the promise did not apply to them individually, nor does it contain any reference to the later apostasy of Judas. On the contrary, this promise would only serve to render his apostasy all the more inexcusable. (Comp. Rev. xxi. 14.)

Judging the twelve tribes of Israel.—As the Apostles appear here in their ideal rather than in their individual capacity, so the "*twelve tribes of Israel*" must be taken in a symbolical sense, as applying to the whole body of believers (*see* Rev. xxi. 12), the term "judging" must not be limited to strictly judicial acts; it rather applies to the theocratic administration of the judges under the Old Testament, all the more, that the twelve tribes are here represented as ideally restored in the final regeneration. Hence we agree with Grotius and Kuinoel in taking the expression in a more general sense, as equivalent to *ruling*. Meyer, however, advocates its literal interpretation. "Believers generally are to share in the future glory and reign of Christ (Rom. viii. 17; 2 Tim. ii. 12), and to have part in the judgment (1 Cor. vi. 2). To the disciples the special prerogative is here accorded, of having part in judging the Jewish people." Still, this critic contradicts himself by immediately adding, that "the outward and apocalyptic form of this promise is unessential." At the same time, he also thinks that "the disciples could not at the time have understood it in any other than a literal sense;" or, in other words, that they must necessarily have misunderstood it. But at this period they must have been fully aware of the fact, that the Old Testament theocracy was to be spiritually restored in and by the Church. Hence, in our view, the expression applies to the spiritual administration and rule of the Apostles, in subordination to the will of the Master; which implied, on the one hand, a real judging of the Jewish people, and on the other, the idea of de Wette, that in proportion to the sacrifices which we make for the sake of the kingdom of heaven, shall be the spiritual power which we exercise, our influence for good, and our usefulness and activity. But as the spiritual supremacy of Christ Himself combined the two elements of *historical and spiritual* efficacy, so the Apostles were to represent the twelve fundamental forms of His reign in the kingdom. (Comp. ch. x.) According to Luke xxii. 30, the Lord repeated the same promise at the institution of the Eucharist.

Ver. 29. **And every one that hath forsaken.** —The promise is now extended so as to apply to Christians at all times. This forsaking of all things is for the twofold purpose of confessing and of following Christ. Both elements are combined in the expression, "for My name's sake," or for the manifestation of My person. The mention of the family-relationship occurs between that of "houses" and of "lands." Accordingly, the former refer not to possessions, but to houses, in the sense of genealogical descent, of nationality, country, or ancestral faith. Thus we have in the text three classes of sacrifices: the first being the most difficult, viz., that of the house in the widest sense of the term; then that of kindred; and, lastly, that of possessions.

Many-fold.—The reading of Codd. B. and L.,

* [Comp. also Rev. xxi. 5: "*Behold, I make all things new.*"—P. S.]

πολλαπλασίονα, *manifold*, is better attested than that of Cod. D., ἑκατονταπλασίονα. Meyer maintains that from the context this promise must refer to the future kingdom of the Messiah. "The statement seems incompatible with Mark x. 30 and Luke xviii. 30, in which abundant compensation is promised even in this world, or previous to the second appearing of Christ." But the supposed mistake lies in reality with the interpreter, who seems to separate entirely between the αἰὼν οὗτος and the αἰὼν ἐρχόμενος. An attentive consideration of the expression καιρὸς οὗτος in the passages to which Meyer refers, might have sufficed to convince him of this. With the resurrection of Christ the αἰὼν ἐρχόμενος, which had been prepared by the life of the Saviour, began even in the outward αἰὼν οὗτος, or in the καιρὸς οὗτος. This regeneration was to continue, to increase, and to develop into the full manifestation of the future *æon* at the glorious appearing of Christ, when it would be completed and made to extend over the whole world. (*See* John v. 25, 28; 1 Cor. xv. 20, 23, 24; Rev. xx, xxi.) Hence we cannot adopt any of the common interpretations of this promise,—such as that it applies to happy Christian connections (Jerome and others), or to Christ Himself (Maldonatus, comp. xii. 49), or to the restoration of all things (1 Cor. iii. 21, Olshausen). In our view, the three classes of blessings promised correspond to the threefold sacrifices demanded in the text. Believers are to find a new and eternal home and country, new and eternal relationships, and new and eternal possessions, of which the blessings enjoyed by them on earth are to be the earnest and foretaste. All these promises are summed up in that of being made heirs of eternal life (Rom. viii.).

Ver. 30. **But many shall be.**—Meyer and Fritzsche suggest that, after the analogy of ch. xx. 16, the expression should be construed as follows: "Many shall be first as the last" (ἔσχατοι ὄντες), "and last as being first" (πρῶτοι ὄντες). But this appears incompatible with the emphasis attaching to the words πρῶτοι and ἔσχατοι, when viewed as special designations; while, on the other hand, the "last" which are to be "first" have not been previously mentioned or described. Manifestly our Lord intended, in the first place, to refer to His disciples and followers, which were the πρῶτοι. To them He gave the richest and fullest promises. But at the same time, also, He sets before them the spiritual conditions of their calling; or, in other words, the limitations and conditions of His promise. Thus the "last" are now prominently brought forward. This subject is more fully explained in the succeeding parable. Hence in ch. xx. 16 the order is reversed, and the last are first, and the first last. Theophylact and Grotius apply the antithesis between the first and the last to the Jews and the Gentiles. De Wette refers it to the different views in reference to the reward: in the one case, in the sight of man; in the other, in that of God. But this interpretation proceeds on the erroneous idea, that the Apostle put the question from a desire for reward, and that the answer of the Lord was virtually a rebuke. Meyer refers the expression to the contrast between the latter and the present *æon*. But this is evidently a mistake. The parable of the vineyard and the laborers shows that the Lord here alludes to the difference *in the time of calling*. Hence it refers to the fact, that earlier or later calling does not imply, as might seem, a higher or a lower standing and reward in the kingdom of heaven. It is not the extensiveness, but the intensiveness, of our service which is to constitute the difference,—all the more that the reward is of free grace alone.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The section under consideration is closely connected with that which preceded it. The warning of Christ as to the danger of riches was intended for the disciples as well as for the young man. They felt this all the more, that He had just "beheld them" with the same look of pity and sympathy which He had cast on the rich young man. Hence, when Peter addressed the Saviour, he "began to say," he "answered," or made confession (Matt. τότε ἀποκριθεὶς; Mark, ἤρξατο λέγειν). The statement, "We have forsaken all, and followed Thee," seemed intended to meet the objection on the score of being rich. Still he ventured to imply that they were not wholly without some claim; nor does he appear to have perceived any incongruity in this. Luke and Mark omit the question: "What shall we have?" although their narratives imply that he had proffered some claim. This diffidence, and the indefinite wording of the inquiry, deserve notice. The expectation of a retribution constituted the difference between the Christian and the Sadducee, who, from the premise, that we ought to love virtue for its own sake, drew the erroneous conclusion, that we should expect no further retribution than the inward reward which virtue afforded to him that practised it. The answer of Christ shows that He acknowledges the validity of our hope of a future reward. At the same time, it also indicates that the disciples had not yet learned fully to understand the spirituality and the bearing of these relations.

2. The promise of the Lord implies the full establishment of His spiritual kingdom, which consists not merely in the restoration of the original state of things in Paradise, but also in the full development of the first into the second life (1 Cor. xv.). In other words, the complete redemption of the world will at the same time be its transformation, when regenerated humanity shall dwell in a completely regenerated world. The centre of this completion of all things shall be the manifestation of Christ in His glory, when He shall appear in all His heavenly brightness. Then all relationships shall partake of, and reflect, the splendor of His manifestation. This will also apply to the administration of His Apostles, as the representatives of His rule over the twelve tribes—a symbolical term, intended to indicate the whole variety of spiritual stages and experiences in the kingdom of heaven. This administration, which at the final manifestation of Christ is to appear in its completeness, commenced with His resurrection. The gradual increase of their power and influence here would correspond with the progress of Christ's work, and the spread of holiness and salvation; while at the same time it would be a token of their future glory in heaven, and of their final acknowledgment on earth.

3. Our Lord adds to the assurance originally given to the disciples, a more general promise addressed to all believers. In the higher sense, and in its real spiritual bearing, every Christian is to receive a hundred-fold for the outward sacrifices which he may have made on behalf of Christ. Similarly, the Apostle Paul reminds us that all things are ours (1 Cor. iii. 21; comp. Rom. viii. 28). In the

Gospel of Mark the special retributions are enumerated.*

4. Having met the hope of His disciples in reference to a future reward, the Lord Jesus, in ver. 30, removes any misunderstanding by striking at the root of anything like a mercenary spirit. He teaches them that the reward is of free grace. Not that it is arbitrary, but that it is not determined by outward priority, either in reference to rank, talent, or time; and that it corresponds to the state of mind and heart, the fundamental characteristic and test being complete self-surrender and absence of any claim or pretension on our part. Peter required this instruction all the more, that he was certainly not entitled to say: "We have forsaken all." If this had been the case, they would not soon afterward have forsaken the Master and fled. But the kingdom of heaven is within,—it is not a system of merit and reward, but the sway and rule of free love.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The free reward in the kingdom of love.—The inquiry of the disciples as to their reward: 1. What it implies: to forsake all things, etc. 2. How difficult it is rightly to express this inquiry. 3. How the Lord admits the rightness of this hope. 4. How He reproves and instructs the disciples in this matter.—Certainty of the great reward: 1. Corresponding to our renunciation; 2. confirmed to us by a solemn *Amen* of the Lord (ver. 28); 3. illustrated by the relations existing in the natural world; 4. presented in its unity and depth (as inheriting eternal life); 5. necessarily determined by the free love of God.—The kingdom of heaven, as that of reward by grace, a blessed realm: 1. It is infinitely elevated above the pride of self-sufficient virtue; 2. above the mercenary spirit of selfishness and servility.—Virtue which disclaims all reward is not genuine. It wants, 1. the light of truth; 2. the warmth of life; 3. the faithfulness of love; 4. the crown of hope.—A mercenary spirit loosing its reward even here: 1. Its service is merely external (a kind of spiritual idleness); 2. its worldly merit meets with a worldly, but only apparent, reward.—The fact, that faith is accompanied by peace, is itself an earnest of future blessedness.—The great renovation of all things forming the certain prospect of Christians. 1. Its certainty—(*a*) from the fact of Christ's advent from heaven (the First-born of all creatures, the First-born from the dead); (*b*) from the regeneration of believers; (*c*) from the birth-throes of the ancient world. 2. The prospects it opens: (*a*) These are infinitely new, and yet familiar to us, being the transformation of things seen; (*b*) they are infinitely rich and varied, yet comprehended in this one thing—eternal life; (*c*) they are definite, yet mysterious, on account of the change of relations: The last shall be first, etc.—Solemnity of the saying, *Many that are first*, etc.—Rev. xxi. 5: "Behold, I make all things new."

* Compare the beautiful verse of Novalis (von Hardenberg):

"Wo ich Ihn nur habe,
Ist mein Vaterland;
Und es fällt mir jede Gabe
Wie ein Erbtheil in die Hand.
Längst vermisste Brüder
Find' ich nun in seinen Jüngern wieder."

Starke:—If the Saviour had bestowed on Peter the supreme rule of the Church on the occasion mentioned in ch. xvi., this question would have had no meaning.—*Canstein:* The man who, although having little, gives it up for the sake of God, and asks for nothing more than His presence, has in reality forsaken much, Ps. lxxiii. 25, 26.—The complete reward of believers will certainly take place, but only at the final regeneration of all things.—The whole world shall, as it were, be born anew.—The faithful disciples and followers of Jesus shall sit with Him on His throne, Rev. iii. 21.—*Zeisius:* Proud self-righteousness and a mercenary spirit ensure their own ruin; while humility and working out our salvation with fear and trembling are the means of preserving us from falling, Phil. ii. 12.—In eternity many of our earthly positions shall be reversed.

Gerlach:—Although the apostles belonged to the lower ranks of society, they were not strictly speaking poor. Thus we read in Mark i. 20, that the father of James and John had employed hired servants.*—When this promise was given, Judas was still one of the twelve, yet it profited him not. A sad evidence this, how little good may be derived from merely outward fellowship with the disciples, if in mind and heart we are strangers to Jesus.

Heubner:—*Gregory the Great* (*Moralia*): We forsake all, if we retain nothing.—Peter referred not to the reward, but to its desert.—To judge means to rule, John xvii. 18, 22.—Many a proud critic, who has looked with contempt upon the Apostles, shall one day behold them with terror.—If you surrender to Christ all you have, He will bestow upon you all He has.—The Christian is daily called upon to deny himself for the sake of Christ.—Montaigne, *Essais*, i. 27: Christianity alone renders perfect friendship possible.

* [It is often inferred from εἰς τὰ ἴδια in John xix. 27, that St. John had a house of his own in Jerusalem· although the term probably applies in a general sense to his home, wherever it was.—P. S.]

B. *The Reward in the Spirit of Free Grace. The Parable of the Laborers in the Vineyard.* CH. XX. 1-16.

(The Gospel for *Septuagesima*.)

1 For the kingdom of heaven is like unto a man *that is* a householder [like to a hu-
man householder, ἀνθρώπῳ οἰκοδεσπότῃ], which [who] went out early in the morning to
2 hire labourers into his vineyard. And when he had agreed [having agreed, συμφωνή-
σας] with the labourers for a penny [denáry, or shilling][1] a day, he sent them into his

3 vineyard. And he went out about the third hour [at nine o'clock, A. M.], and saw others
4 standing idle in the market-place, And said unto them, Go ye also into the vineyard;
5 and whatsoever is right I will give you. And they went their way. Again he went
6 out about the sixth [at noon] and ninth hour [at three o'clock, P. M.], and did likewise. And
about the eleventh hour [an hour before sunset] he went out, and found others standing
7 idle,[2] and saith unto them, Why stand ye here all the day idle? They say unto him,
Because no man hath hired us. He saith unto him, Go ye also into the vineyard; and
8 whatsoever is right, *that* shall ye receive.[3] So when even [evening] was come, the
lord of the vineyard saith unto his steward [overseer], Call the labourers, and give
9 them *their* hire, beginning from the last unto the first. And when they came that *were*
hired about the eleventh hour, they received every man a penny [denáry, shilling].
10 But when the first came, they supposed that they should have received [should receive,
11 λήψονται] more; and they likewise received every man a penny [denáry]. And when
they had received *it*, they murmured against the goodman of the house [householder,
12 οἰκοδεσπότου], Saying, These last have wrought [made] *but* one hour, and thou hast
made them equal unto us, which [who] have borne the burden and heat of the day.
13 But he answered one of them, and said, Friend,[4] I do thee no wrong: didst not thou
14 agree with me for a penny [denáry, or shilling]? Take *that* thine *is* [what is thine,
τὸ σόν, lit.: the thine], and go thy way: [but] I will give unto this last, even as unto
15 thee. Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with mine own? Is thine eye evil, be-
16 cause I am good? So the last shall be first, and the first last: for many be [are] call-
ed, but few chosen.[5]

[1] Ver. 2.—[Ἐκ δηναρίου. The foreign term ought to have been retained in English, as Matthew retained the Latin *denarius* in Greek. The English Version is here peculiarly unfortunate, and makes a false impression on the common reader. A *penny* would be a poor reward indeed, but a *denarius* is worth more than seven English pence or fifteen American cents, and was a liberal day's wages at that time. About two thirds of a Roman denáry (not a full denáry as generally stated) was the daily pay of the Roman soldier. Comp. Tacitus, *Annal.* i. 17. Polybius (ii. 15) mentions that the charge for a day's entertainment in the inns of Cisalpine Gaul was only half an ass or one twentieth of a denarius. Bengel intimates that the daily wages in his time (before the middle of the last century) were not higher: *Denarius erat diurna merces, ut fere est hodierno die. Shilling* would be a far better popular equivalent for *denarius* than *penny*. *See* note 4 on p. 332.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 6.—Ἀργούς (*idle*) is wanting in Codd. B., C., D., L., and many others [also in Cod. Sinait.], and is inserted from ver. 3 and the question immediately following. In this place it does not strengthen, but weaken the sense.

[3] Ver. 7.—The words: *and whatsoever is right, that shall ye receive*, καὶ ὃ ἐὰν ᾖ δίκαιον λήψεσθε, are missing in Codd. B., D., L., Z., [Cod. Sinait.], the Vulgate, and other old versions. Meyer, however, observes that the expression λήψεσθε instead of δώσω ὑμῖν speaks against the insertion of this sentence from ver. 4.

[4] Ver. 13.—[*Friend* is almost too strong for the Greek ἑταῖρε (*comrade, companion, fellow*), while "*fellow*," as now used, would be too disrespectful. It is here used as a term of cautious respect with reproving import. The Vulgate translates: *amice;* Augustine better: *sodalis;* all the German versions but one: *Freund*, as all English versions have *friend*. The word is often used in the address of a superior to an inferior, as a servant or a disciple, and occurs four times in the N. T.: here, Matt. xxii. 12 (of the guest who had no wedding garment), xxvi. 50 (of Judas when he betrayed his Master with a kiss), and xi. 16; in the last passage the E. V. translates: *fellows*, in all others: *friend*. Grotius: "*Compellatio leviter notis accommodata.*" Meyer compares the German *Kamerad*, but this, like *fellow*, would not be dignified enough. We must, therefore, retain *friend* in the absence of a precise equivalent.—P. S.]

[5] Ver. 16.—The last words: πολλοὶ γάρ εἰσιν κλητοί, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοί, are not found in B., L., Z., [and Cod. Sinai.t], Copt. Sahid. But Meyer rightly objects to the hypothesis of interpolation from Matt. xx. 14, since there was no occasion for it here, the words appearing rather out of place in this connection. [Lachmann, Tischendorf (ed. of 1859), and Alford retain the sentence, and Tischendorf says: *Cur vero ex xxii. 14 huc transtulerint vix dixeris.* The homœoteleuton ἔσχαTOI—ἐκλεκTOI easily explains the omission of the sentence by some transcribers. Κλητοί and ἐκλεκτοί are a paronomasia in Greek, which is lost in the E. V. In German it might be rendered by *erwählt* and *auserwählt*.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1. **For the kingdom of heaven is like.**—This parable is evidently intended as an illustration and explanation of Christ's former teaching [especially of the last verse of the preceding chapter, as is shown by the connecting γάρ. Hence the division of chapters here, as Trench justly observes, is peculiarly unfortunate.] For a number of ancient treatises on this parable, *see* Lilienthal's *Bibl. Archivarius*, p. 91; for more recent discussions, the *Studien und Kritiken* (Rupprecht, 1847, p. 396 sqq.; Steffensen, 1848, p. 686 sqq.). On the difficulties of this parable [second only to those of the parable of the Unjust Steward], *see* Heubner, p. 300. [Latin dissertations on the *Parabola de Operariis in Vinea*, by J. L. Mosheim, 1724; A. H. Faust, 1725; F. S. Lœffler, 1726; F. A. Zülich, 1741; J. R. Kiesling, 1740; J. H. Schramm, 1775, etc. Of English expositions, *see* especially TRENCH, *Notes on the Parables*, 9th Lond. ed., 1863, pp. 161–184, and Alford *in loc.*—P. S.]

A human householder.—In contrast to God, who is the Householder in the highest and truest sense. As in ch. xiii. 24; xviii. 23. [It is plain that *the householder* signifies God; *the vineyard*, the kingdom of heaven (comp. Is. v. 1–7; Cant. viii. 12); *the steward* (ver. 8), Christ; *the twelfth hour* of the day, or *the evening*, the parusia of Christ; *the other hours*, the different periods of calling and its service. The difficulty lies in the symbolical meaning of the *denáry* and in determining the chief lesson of the parable. *See* below.—P. S.]

Ver. 2. **For a denary** (or **shilling**) **a day.**—Both these terms are intended to express the fact,

that the servants were hired in the proper sense of the term, which is also implied in ἐκ δηναρίου. A Roman *denarius* was the common pay for a day's labor (Tob. v. 14: *a drachma*). The Attic *drachma* was equal to the Roman *denarius*, and amounted to six *oboli*, or about seven and a half pence sterling, or fifteen American cents. "That this hire was equitable,* appears from the circumstance that at a time of scarcity, the denarius would be sufficient to purchase what was requisite for man's daily support; Rev. vi. 6." Starke.

[The meaning of the denáry is a *crux interpretum*, and reminds us of what Chrysostom and Maldonatus say *in loc.*, that we must not scrupulously press every particular in a parable, but keep always in view the general scope. Parables are poetic pictures taken from real life for the illustration of the higher truths and realities of the kingdom of heaven, and contain with the essential figures some ornamental touches which are necessary for the artistic finish, although they may not express definitely a corresponding idea or fact in the spiritual world. The denáry here undoubtedly conveys the idea of reward, but in a very general way. As soon as we particularize it, we get into almost inextricable difficulties. Two opposite views must be mentioned. (1) The denáry means the *temporal* reward only, and those who were hired first, while they receive their stipulated denáry, lose eternal life and are ultimately lost. The Lord says to them at last: Take thy miserable penny, the wages of a day-laborer on *earth*, and go thy way (ὕπαγε), *i. e.*, depart from Me (ver. 14). So Luther (in his later writings: The penny is the temporal good, the favor of the householder, the eternal good; the murmuring laborers trot away with their penny, and are damned), more recently Stier (who zealously and elaborately defends this interpretation), W. Nast (who fully agrees with him), and Wordsworth. At first sight this view offers a plausible escape from the difficulties of the second, but it is hardly in keeping with the dignity of the parable, and is made impossible by the fact that the penny is paid at the close of the day, *i. e.*, at the end of man's life or the day of final account, when the temporal reward *ceases*. Godliness is indeed profitable for all things and has the promise of this life as well as of that which is to come; but the temporal blessings accompany the work itself, while the eternal reward follows it after it is finished. (2) The denáry means *eternal salvation*. So Origen, Augustine (*Serm.* 343: "*Denarius ille vita æterna est, quæ omnibus par est*"), Gregory I., Bernard, Luther (in his Com. on Gal. iii. 2), Maldonatus (*salus et vita æterna*), Meyer (*das Messianische Heil*), Lange (with some modification: the blessing of Christian communion, *see* his *Doctrinal Thoughts* below), Alford (eternal life, or God Himself), and many others. To this view the following objections may be urged: (*a*) Eternal life is not a reward or wages for work performed, but a free gift of grace. All right; yet there is a reward of *grace* as well as a reward of *merit*, and in the former sense eternal life is constantly represented by Christ and the apostles as a μισθός (variously rendered in the E. V. by *reward*, *hire*, and *wages*), *see* Matt. v. 12 ("great is your reward in heaven"); x. 41, 42; Luke vi. 23, 35; x. 7; John iv. 36; 1 Cor. iii. 8, 14; etc. The selection of so small a price as a denáry for so great a good as eternal life is to be explained from the nature of the parable and the fact that a denáry was the usual pay for a day's work.—(*b*) The laborers who were first called, engaged in the service of God in a mercenary spirit, which is indicated by ἐκ δηναρίου, *i. e.*, *for the sake of* a denáry,* and their murmuring and dissatisfaction, as well as the rebuke administered to them on the day of account (vers. 11–15), seems inconsistent with the fact of their final salvation. For envy, as Wordsworth remarks, disqualifies for heaven and is an inward hell. But it should be observed, first, that the murmuring occurs *before* they enter into heaven proper; secondly, that the laborers who were called first, are placed, not *outside* of the kingdom of heaven, but simply *last* in the kingdom, xix. 30; xx. 16; thirdly, that we have a full parallel in the parable of the Prodigal Son, whose elder brother showed envy and anger at the mercy extended to the Prodigal, and yet the father expressly said unto him: "Son, thou art ever with me, and all that I have is thine;" Luke xv. 28–31. In both cases this manifestation of dissatisfaction must be explained from a primary reference of the parable to the Jews and their inveterate and almost insurmountable prejudice against the Gentiles. It is introduced for the purpose of rebuking their mercenary and envious disposition, and commending the more disinterested spirit of the Gentile converts who went to work as soon as they were called, without a definite agreement as to price, but implicitly trusting in the justice and mercy of the householder, who would give them far more than they could ask or deserve. But although the laborers who were called first, were ultimately admitted into heaven with the rest, yet many of them occupy there the last place, and enjoy a far inferior degree of glory than many others who were called last. *Cœlum omnibus est idem, sed gloria dispar*, or as Augustine has it: *splendor dispar, cœlum commune*. Thus the denáry, or final reward, although the same objectively considered, is very different subjectively, according to the different degrees of capacity for bliss, and moral perfection on the part of the receivers. Comp. 1 Cor. xv. 41, and the parable of the talents, Matt. xxv. 15–30, and the parable of the pounds, Luke xix. 12–26. With this explanation we regard the second view as substantially correct, certainly preferable to the first, although it is doubtful whether we are authorized, in the original sense and intent of the parable, to go beyond the *general* idea of *reward*. Comp. Lange's *Doctrinal Thoughts* below.—P. S.]

The expression **day** refers to that period of time in the narrower sense. The Jews reckoned the day in the wider sense from sunset to sunset (comp. Lev. xxiii. 32). Before the Babylonish captivity the day was divided into morning, noon, evening, and a twofold twilight. Gradually, however, the division into *hours* was introduced, which in the Old Testament occur under the Chaldee designation of שָׁעָה. The Jews seem to have adopted the division of the day into hours during their residence in Babylon. As every *natural* day was divided into twelve hours, their duration necessarily varied at different

* [This must be the meaning of *die* Billigkeit *dieses Tagelohns*, and not (as the connection shows in the passage quoted from Starke) *small* or *cheap*, as the Edinb. tra. has it; for a *denarius* was liberal pay for a day's work at the time of Christ. Comp. Note 1, p. 352.—P. S.]

* [Meyer *in loc.*: "Ἐκ signifies not the price (which would be expressed by the genitive, ver. 13), although the denáry is the price, but it represents this price as the causal feature or motive of the agreement. Comp. Matthiæ, p. 1334."—P. S.]

periods of the year. The longest day in Palestine consists of fourteen hours and twelve minutes; the shortest, of nine hours and forty-eight minutes. About the third hour, or at nine o'clock in the morning, the market-place would be full of people. "Vitringa applies the term *hours* to different periods of history. Thus he regards 'early in the morning,' = Adam; 'the third hour,' = Abraham; 'the sixth hour,' = Moses; 'the ninth hour,' = the latter times, when the Edomites, under John Hyrcanus, became converts to Judaism; 'the eleventh hour,' = the time of Christ. Similarly Origen and Hilary." * Heubner.—On this point comp. the *Doctrinal Thoughts* below.

Ver. 4. **Whatever is right.**—In the general sense; whatever is equitable. The idea of a regular engagement for a definite hire gradually disappears. The first laborers were hired for a day; their enumeration being not only fixed, but serving as their motive (ἐκ). The next laborers were merely promised an equitable acknowledgment of their services; while in the last instance, according to the best accredited reading (ver. 7), no promise at all was made to those who went into the vineyard.

Ver. 7. **Because no man hath hired us.**—This trait is of great importance in the interpretation of the parable. Comp. Rom. xi.; Acts xiv. 16.

Ver. 8. **Unto his steward,** ἐπίτροπος.—The term was equally applied to those who administered whole provinces and single households. In this case, the steward of a household. [Christ is the overseer set over the house of God and entrusted with the whole economy of salvation including the distribution of the final rewards, Heb. iii. 6; John v. 27; Rev. ii. 7, 10, 17, 28, etc.—P. S.]—**Their hire.**—Meyer: The hire which the master had previously told him to give. But in this case it is intended to combine the idea of a day's hire with that of hire in the more general sense; in short, the full amount of their hire.

Ver. 9. [It is a gratuitous assumption that the last hired laborers worked as much in one hour as the rest during several hours or the whole day, and that for this reason they received the same reward. God does, indeed, not measure His reward by the length of man's life, but by the intensity of his labor and the fidelity of his services, and the parable implies a protest against the *quantitative* appreciation of men's works, as distinct from the *qualitative*. But this is not the *main* lesson of the parable, as Maldonatus † and Kuinoel affirm, else the circumstance, on which the narrative turned, would have been mentioned in this place or afterwards.—P. S.]

Ver. 12. **Have done (*spent*) but one hour,** ἐποίησαν.—Not *wrought*, but passed one hour in working. Evidently indicating their contempt for the others; which also appears from such expressions as "*these last*," and from their laying stress on their own work. This is likewise implied in the arrangement of the words: "Thou hast made them equal unto us—unto us who have borne the burden of the day (having wrought for twelve hours), and its heat (at noon)." Καύσων, lit.: the *scorcher*, used here in the general sense for noon-day heat, but in the Sept. frequently for the hot wind from the south.

Ver. 13. **But he answered one of them.**—This trait must not be overlooked. The householder does not deem it necessary to excuse his conduct before all the laborers, and only explains it to one of them, by way of information for the rest.

Friend.—Not ironically, but as an expression of kindness, to show that the rebuke which followed was not the result of partiality.

Ver. 15. **Is thine eye evil?**—Not a doubtful question, nor a mere suggestion, but intended to show the impropriety of such evil seeing, when the householder manifested so much kindness. On the expression ὀφθαλμὸς πονηρός, comp. Matt. vi. 23; Prov. xxviii. 22. In this instance it refers to *envy*. History records the terrible consequences of such "an evil eye" ever since the time of Cain. Eastern and Southern nations assign a pernicious and baneful effect to the evil eye.

Ver. 16. **The last shall be first.**—On the ground to which we have before referred, the statement is here reversed.

[This verse contains the lesson of the parable, comp. the last verse of the preceding chapter and the connecting γάρ in the first verse of this. It illustrates the truth that many (not *all*, *see* xix. 30) first shall be last, and (many) last shall be first, or that the order in the calling of individuals and nations will in many cases be reversed in their final position in heaven. This truth is an encouragement to those who are called at a late period of their lives, but still more a solemn warning to those who are called early, urging them to be humble and ever mindful of their unworthiness before God, lest they be overtaken by others or forfeit the reward altogether. Bengel observes on ἔσονται: *respectu apostolorum non est prædictio sed admonitio.* The admonition contained in the words: *the first shall be last*, was intended first for apostles, especially for Peter, whose self-exalting and somewhat mercenary question in ch. xix. 27 called forth this parable, and whose subsequent history sadly revealed the danger of self-confidence; then for Jewish Christians generally, who were so prone to look down with envy upon the Gentile converts, and to set up peculiar claims, as if salvation was of merit and not of free grace; and lastly, for all Christians, who enjoy special spiritual privileges and the great blessing of an early acquaintance with the Saviour.—This is the main lesson of the parable as plainly set forth in the opening and concluding sentences. What other commentators have set forth as the main lesson, is either not taught at all, or taught only incidentally or by implication, as: the equality of rewards in the kingdom of heaven (Augustine, etc.; but this must be modified by the doctrine of different degrees of glory); the kingdom of heaven is of *grace*, not of debt, but God will strictly fulfil all his covenant promise in its integrity (Rupprecht, Alford); God rewards not according to the time, but according to the kind and fidelity of service (Maldonatus), etc.—P. S.]

For many are called.—Our Lord here shows that this reversal of the outward order was not arbitrary, but depended upon a higher and internal order. Those who are chosen do not exclude them that are merely called; but, from their earnestness and the absence of all mercenary spirit, they occupy a higher

* [Especially also Gregory (*Homil.* 19 *in Evang.*) who refers the morning to the age from Adam to Noah, the third hour to the age from Noah to Abraham, the sixth hour to that from Abraham to Moses, the ninth hour to that from Moses to Christ, and the eleventh hour to that from Christ to the end of the world. But the same writer applies the different hours also to the different ages in the life of individuals: childhood, youth, manhood, old age, and the years of decrepitude. The latter interpretation is also held by Jerome, Theophylact, Maldonatus.—P. S.]

† ["*Finis ergo parabolæ est, mercedem vitæ æternæ non tempori, quo quis laboravit, sed labori et operi, quod fecit, respondere.*"—P. S.]

place than the latter. This characteristic is indicated in the parable by the circumstance, that these laborers went to the vineyard without the promise of any definite hire, and even without the assurance of any reward at all. On the other hand, in Matt. xxii. 14 the expression *chosen* applies to a real selection from among those that were called or invited, to whom alone the blessings of justification and final glory were awarded. In other words, the awful difference between those who are called and those who are chosen is only indicated in our passage, while it is fully carried out in ch. xxii. [Trench explains: "Many are called to work in God's vineyard, but few retain that temper of spirit, humility, and submission to God, which will allow them at last to be partakers of His reward." Similarly Alford, who disconnects these words from the parable. But the connection is more readily accounted for if we explain the sentence somewhat differently here, from what is its obvious meaning in the parable of the Marriage of the King's Son (Matt. xxii. 14), where it contains the moral of the parable. Bengel *in loc.* observes: "Ἐκλεκτοί *exquisiti præ aliis. Videtur, hoc loco, ubi primum occurrit, non omnes salvandos denotare, sed horum excellentissimos.*" So Olshausen, who makes the *called* and the *chosen* alike partakers of final salvation, but with different degrees of standing.—P. S.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *Meaning of this parable.*—It is unnecessary to prove that the vineyard is intended to designate the kingdom of heaven (*see* Isa. v. 1; Matt. xxi. 28, 33). The kingdom of heaven is compared to a vineyard because it produces the noblest fruits, even love, peace, and blessedness, of which the precious fruit of the vine is a faint emblem. Besides, the need of careful cultivation and of seasonable weather, as also of good soil and sunny exposure, and of a favorable climate, are features which make the vineyard a fit symbol of the kingdom of heaven.

But the first point to be ascertained is, whether the vineyard is intended as an emblem of the kingdom of God generally, in its various economies, or only of the New Testament economy of the Church. According to Gray, Seiler, and others, the first hired were the Jews, and those who were last engaged, the Gentiles. Heubner denies the correctness of this view. It is certainly of great importance to remember that this parable was primarily, and almost exclusively, intended for the disciples. Hence it must evidently refer, in the first place, to the New Testament economy, although it is at the same time applicable to the various economies of the kingdom of God; while Matt. xxi. 33 primarily refers to the Old Testament economy and its termination. By thus restricting the import of the parable, its leading features become more distinct and definite. Above all, it is of the greatest importance to keep in mind that it is intended to illustrate the statement, "*Many* that are first shall be last," but not meant to teach that *all* that are first shall be last, etc. Perhaps we might arrive at such a conclusion from the circumstance, that in the parable all that are first are described as sharing the same mercenary spirit; but this is only intended to convey the idea that, as a body, and in reference to their general spirit, such was the case. We shall by and by see in what sense this was true.

To return: The vineyard is the kingdom of heaven under the New Testament, from its first commencement; the householder is God (*see* the passages above quoted); the steward is Christ, in His capacity as the Judge of the world (Matt. xxv.); the laborers are, in the first place, the regular ministers in the kingdom of God, and secondarily, believers in general. To this interpretation Heubner objects, that the people must be represented by the vineyard itself. In answer to this, we again remind the reader, that symbolical expressions must not be confounded with dogmatical statements. Thus, on one occasion, our Lord Himself is compared to a vine (John xv. 1); while on another, even the weakest Christians may be designated as laborers in the vineyard, just as in Matt. xxi. 31 converted publicans and harlots are compared to the son who, returning to his obedience, goes to work in the vineyard. Every Christian must seek to advance the kingdom of God, or be a laborer in His vineyard—by his confession, by his Christian conduct, and, above all, by the spiritual character which attaches to his ordinary labor and avocation, however humble it may appear in the sight of men. The different laborers evidently indicate not only different stages of faith and worth, but also difference of individuality. Their reward is given them individually, while the explanation of the householder is also addressed to one of them individually. Similarly, the different hours refer not only to different periods in the history of the Church, but also to different stages in our own life and experience, although the former idea is perhaps more prominently brought out. Hence we may remark, that those who were hired "early in the morning" were not merely the Apostles, but also *Jewish Christians* generally. Accordingly, the whole of that class are represented in the parable as displaying a mercenary spirit—a characteristic which, so far as the Apostles were concerned, was only intended as a warning. This will also assist us in explaining the statement about the denáry. Those who were hired in the third hour were found standing in the market-place. This may probably be referred to the Jewish proselytes, who congregated along with the Jews in the most public place of the kingdom of heaven as then existing, or in the synagogue. Those who were hired at the sixth and the ninth hour, were the Gentile races who inhabited the ancient Greek and Roman empires, and those barbarous tribes who, after the migration of nations, were brought into the Church. Lastly, they who were converted at the eleventh hour may be the last fruits from among the Jews and Gentiles, gathered through the missionary labors of the latter days. The evening is the hour of final reward for those who labored in the vineyard. That festive evening of the Church will take place at the second appearing of Christ—which must not be confounded with the final judgment;—while, so far as each individual is concerned, the festive evening commences with our entrance into the Church triumphant, although in a certain sense it may be said to begin whenever we taste of the blessings connected with the invisible Church. From the general character of this parable, it is evident that its main point lies in the idea of an hour of reward. It is not easy to ascertain the exact meaning attaching to the hire of a denáry or shilling (*see* Heubner, p. 300). Gerhard remarks, in his *Harmonia*, that the denáry refers to Christ Himself; while, according to Augustine and Luther (Gall. iii. 2), it means eternal life. In another place, however, Luther remarks that the dená

ry referred to temporal possessions,* while the favor of the householder constituted the eternal reward of the laborers. Heubner suggests that the denáry refers to the reward generally; H. Müller, that it applies to all rewards of grace, both in this and in a future life. But if the labor in the vineyard is performed in the service of the Church, the hire must equally refer to Christian fellowship. This blessing may be characterized as forming part of the outward manifestation of the kingdom of Christ and of its benefits. By the word and sacraments—by which Christ is brought to us—we have even now "part and lot in this matter." But the history of the Jewish Christian Church shows that we may lose our enjoyment of this portion even while possessing it. They had agreed with the Householder ἐκ δηναρίου: for the sake of the kingdom of Messiah, and of their part in it, they had gone into the vineyard, or entered the Church. It deserves notice, that the prospect of this kingdom was not so clearly set before those who—so to speak—were engaged at a later hour. In their case, only a general promise was given, and they were to receive whatsoever was right. On this assurance they went into the vineyard. Lastly, as we have seen, according to the best reading (ver. 7), no mention of any reward was made to those who came at the eleventh hour. Apparently, they were satisfied to be delivered from total inactivity, and happy at the prospect of securing by their labors the favor of Him who had called them. This will serve to explain how, while the same reward was given to all, it led to such a difference of feeling among the laborers. Manifestly, any idea of dissatisfaction or murmuring would be entirely inadmissible, if the reward accorded to the laborers had referred either to Christ Himself, or else to eternal life. On the other hand, temporal possessions would scarcely be characterized as a reward for labor in the vineyard of the Lord. But a share in the blessings of the Church, or in the manifestation of Christ, is a spiritual possession, which at the same time may produce in different persons different, and even contrary, results. This may also serve to throw some light on the parable of the ten virgins. It accounts for the dissatisfaction of the first laborers on receiving the same reward as the last. The Jewish Christians were dissatisfied because the Gentiles were to obtain the same share in the blessings of the Church, or in the kingdom of Messiah. They expected that some distinctive privileges would accrue to them, and thus lapsed into Ebionism, and in the end became the last (even as is the case with the Jewish nation generally). Similarly, at the moment when Judas obtained his share in the Church, at the first celebration of the Eucharist, his murmuring and dissatisfaction became open apostasy.

This leads us to the next inquiry, whether those who were last rewarded were in reality lost, as their murmuring and envy would seem to indicate, or whether they were only reproved for their pretensions and claims. The fact that they received a denáry seems in favor of the latter view; but, on the other hand, they appear to have raised some objections to taking their hire, as appears from the expression, "Take what is thine." When combining this with the circumstance that they were last rewarded, we infer that our Lord intends to indicate that an immense difference of internal capability for spiritual blessings existed between them—pointing forward to the contrast of eternal blessedness and everlasting misery. This is also implied in the parable of the prodigal son, while it is fully brought out in that of the wise and foolish virgins. We need scarcely add that such was really the case in the history of the Church. While the one party regarded the denáry as a scanty and even poor reward, the other took it as a sign and seal of the infinite favor of the Master, and of the free love of God and of Christ. Thus legalism regards, for example, the Lord's Supper as a merely outward ordinance, implying legal absolution and reconciliation with the Church; while to the humble believer it is a seal of pardon and of final salvation. This difference of view depends on whether we regard the kingdom of heaven in an outward and legalistic manner as conferring certain privileges and rewards, or in an inward and spiritual manner as the kingdom of free love. But there are certain characters who, though intensely conscientious and earnest, are destitute of love. In their case, the difference between those that are chosen depends exclusively on a smaller capacity for receiving the blessing. But those who are selfish and mere professors are not only less capable of receiving the blessing; they also convert the blessing into a curse. Thus the shilling of reward becomes to them ultimately a punishment and a judgment. But in this parable this point is only alluded to; the main object being to show that many of the last shall be first, to the glory and praise of free grace, and as displaying the righteousness and glory of God.

2. On a previous occasion, the Lord had taught the disciples that the grace of God and the faith or unbelief of man were capable of annulling and bridging over every distance of space in the kingdom of heaven (Matt. viii. 11). In the present instance, He shows that the same holds true with reference to time. Grace can not only equalize, but—so to speak—reverse, the times of outward service; and it does so in many cases. It seems as if it restored to genuine believers the time which they had lost. Nay, it may convert one day into a thousand years, and a thousand years into one day.

3. We would call special attention to the spiritual progress marked in the parable by the fact, that the idea of a hire gradually recedes from view.

4. The fundamental idea of this parable is the free reward of the kingdom of heaven, not as dictated by arbitrary motives, but as depending on the internal state of mind and heart, in opposition to the legal and common reward in the service of works, which is determined by only outward considerations. The kingdom of heaven does not consist in merely outward performances, to which a certain value attaches. This idea, which was so much fostered by the legalistic spirit of the Pharisees, was all the more effectually refuted in this parable, that it seemed at first, to a certain extent, to admit its accuracy. But after having presented the kingdom of heaven under the figure of hired servants, the parable gradually changes, and exhibits in all its fulness the economy of sovereign mercy, compassion, and love. All these exhibitions are indeed based on the idea of justice—every laborer receives a shilling, none receives too little. But in its combination with love, justice assumes a higher form, and those who have only labored part of the day receive the hire of full work. Hence, according to the notions of legalism, they received too much. But grace manifests itself not only in giving the shilling to those who were last engaged, but also

* [So also Stier, Nast, and Wordsworth.—P. S.]

in giving it first to them, while the earliest laborers are last paid. Nor is this dispensation arbitrary, but based on *truth*. Thus it appears that a mercenary spirit brings its own judgment. It leads to dissatisfaction with the promised reward, and to contempt and envy of those who may have been made the subjects of grace. On the other hand, the latter in reality possess superior inward qualification, as appears from the fact that they agreed to commence labor late in the day, and in simple trustfulness, without any promise of definite reward. Similarly, it is now seen that the shilling, which the one class receives with dissatisfaction and murmuring, is hailed by the other as a reward of free grace. Thus the parable points forward to that of the prodigal, in which the elder son is represented as having been all along in his father's house, and shared all his possessions without ever rejoicing in his inheritance. Lastly, the righteousness of the reward appears from this, that while the selfishness of the earlier laborers converts their hire into a judgment, it is received by the others as a gift of grace, by which they become the free servants and fellow-laborers of their Lord and Master.

5. It is important to remember that this reward is of grace, although not in the sense of any arbitrariness, nor to the exclusion of the requirements of strict justice. Everything that we possess is indeed a gift of God, in the twofold sense of our having received it either naturally or by grace. Accordingly, every idea of merit in the literal or worldly sense is entirely excluded; yet there is a reward and return, in the relationship subsisting between God and man in the covenant, and in the interchange between promise and duty. To banish every trace of a mercenary spirit, it is not necessary to suppose that believers are not to receive any reward, but to recognize that, along with the penny which Supreme Justice has accorded on the ground of free love, we have by grace received the whole kingdom of heaven, with all that it implies—even as we are able to receive it, in humility and self-surrender, and far above all that we could ask or desire.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The word of the Lord: "The last shall be first, and the first last." 1. Illustrated by the parable of the laborers in the vineyard; 2. explained by the declaration, "Many are called, but few chosen."—The laborers in the vineyard: 1. The vineyard of the Lord, and labor in it. 2. The calling and the character of the laborers. 3. The work and the hire. 4. The equality and the difference of the reward.—The equality and the difference in the outward form of the kingdom of God: 1. The equality and the difference of the laborers. All are called to be servants in the kingdom; but one class consists of those who are merely *called*, or who are external and legal laborers, while the others are also *chosen*, their labor being internal and free. 2. The equality and the difference of their work. Their service is one of simple obedience; but in the one case there was the advantage of priority, while at the same time some (not all of them) seem to have felt the service a burden. The others were engaged for a shorter period, but labored in confidence and joy. 3. The equality and the difference of the reward: all received the shilling. The external blessing attaching to service in the kingdom of heaven remains the same. All have part in the Church, in its fellowship and its privileges. But to some this appears a scanty hire, if not a kind of punishment; while to those who receive it in faith, it is a sign of infinite grace.—Late repentance.—The festive evening-time.—The reward which the Lord will ultimately grant to His servants: 1. It is not arbitrary, but in accordance with the strictest justice (He rewards *only* His laborers; He rewards *all* His laborers; He gives the same *reward* to all His laborers as such). The equality of the denáry a figure of the equality of God's justice. 2. It is not limited, but free and rich, according to the fulness of His love (even those who were last called received a denáry, and may perhaps have received it before the others). 3. It is not a mysterious and silent fate, but the ways of wisdom, which justify themselves.—How the kingdom of free love is reared on the basis of God's justice.—The kingdom of justice is also that of love: (*a*) This love is ever just; (*b*) this justice is ever love.—How a mercenary spirit destroys the position of a laborer in the kingdom of God: He makes merchandize of the calling of God (instead of being a fellow-worker, he becomes an unfaithful, hired servant); he converts the word of God into mere traditions, the work of faith into a burden, the hope of a reward into a claim, and the blessings granted into a judgment.—The one shilling, or the blessing of legal return, may lead some to heaven, while others convert it into a curse.—Comparison between the first and the last laborers: At first merely a difference, but at last a contrast, between them.—The solemn word of the Judge: *Take what is thine.*—How self-righteousness brings its own judgment.—How it refutes itself: 1. It demands the promised reward, and yet always expects more. 2. It only seeks its own, and yet looks with envy upon others. 3. It does not care for the friendship of the Lord nor the prosperity of His vineyard, but attempts to use Him and the vineyard as a means toward an end; while at the same time he grudges to others the favor of the Lord which they enjoy.—The evil eye of those who are merely outward workers, as illustrated by the history of the Church from the commencement of the kingdom (Cain) until now.—The dire effects of this evil eye.—How the grace of God makes up for everything to the laborers who have entered even at a late hour,—1. for lost time; 2. for loss of service; 3. for a lost life; 4. for the loss of the fruits of life.—Import of the shilling to various classes of laborers: 1. It is viewed as the just reward: the *value* of the labor (Church-fellowship in return for confession and profession). 2. Viewed from a legal point, as if the labor had been forcibly taken; in which case it becomes a spiritual judgment. 3. Viewed as the reward of love: as the blessing attaching to genuine labor and the pledge of eternal salvation.—What has the legal church to do with that of love?—What have those who are merely outward laborers to do with the blessedness enjoyed by true believers?—Import of the fact that legalism would fain limit and restrain the exercise of free grace (the Lord, His love, His grace, heaven, the Church, inward life).—The signs of a sad evening-time: 1. Murmuring on looking back on the labor and its results. 2. An evil eye with reference to our neighbor and his success. 3. Self-contradiction, and the merited rebuke. 4. The loss of the capacity of enjoying the blessing in peace and gratitude.—How the return made us in the kingdom of God becomes a real reward: 1. If it has been preceded by joy in the work. 2. If it is a pledge of further

activity. 2. If it is a sign and seal of the favor of the Lord.—The characteristic marks of those who are chosen: 1. They wait for the call of love without knowing it. 2. They gladly enter the kingdom of love without hesitating. 3. They do service in the trustfulness of love, without bargaining. 4. They regard the outward and finite reward as an emblem and a pledge of the infinite love of their Master, without seeking merely the outward hire.

Starke:—*Zeisius*: Eternal salvation is indeed a gift of free grace, but God will have no idle people: He wants laborers in His vineyard.—To stand idle in the market-place of the world.—We must follow the call of God.—We should ever keep in view the reward, Gen. xii. 1.—God stretcheth forth his hands all day long, Rom. x. 21.—While bearing the burden of the day, let us comfort ourselves with thoughts of the evening of rest.—What God has promised He will certainly perform.—True repentance is never too late.—The penitent thief on the cross.—But it is a most dangerous thing to defer the work of salvation to the last hour.—All legalists are actuated by a mercenary spirit.—*Nova Bibl. Tub.*: "What advantage then have we? Is God unjust? Has God cast away His people? Rom. xi. 1, 2. Such is the murmuring language of a mercenary spirit."—Presumption of the hired servants: 1. They boast in their own merits (ch. vii. 22; xix. 20); 2. they despise and envy others (Luke xv. 2); nay, they presume to question God Himself (Job xxxi. 2).—Presume not to question God's mode of administration.—God rewards us as we serve Him.—God is justified when He speaketh, Ps. li. 4.—God has power to do with His own as He pleases.

Lisco:—The laborers: not merely the ministers of the word, but all Christians.—*Luther*: These words, "The first shall be last," are intended to remove all presumption, and to prevent our exalting ourselves above any sinner; while the clause, "The last shall be first," is directed against despair.

Heubner:—It is grace which calls, grace which renders us fit for service, and grace which promises and bestows the reward.—This call is heard in all ages of the Church, and at different periods of our lives.—Our whole life is only one day.—There is a difference between standing idle and going idle.—How many idlers there are in this world! Such are all who only live for themselves.—In proportion as you have formerly lost time, be earnest, diligent, and active in employing the rest of your life.—There is an eternal festive evening for the laborers in Christ's vineyard.—Conceit and a mercenary spirit lead to dissatisfaction with the ways of God.—There is a great deal of murmuring against the providence of God: 1. In point of fact—murmuring on account of want of outward prosperity, etc.; 2. expressed in various ways—being open or concealed, etc.—The servile spirit, which leads us to regard labor in the vineyard as a burden, renders it really heavy.—The strict justice of God dispensing what is right to every one, even to mercenary laborers.—We shall certainly receive what our labor deserves.—Even merely external virtues, however worthless in a spiritual sense, receive a certain reward; as, for example, chastity, temperance, etc.—The coarse envy of carnal men is directed against the earthly happiness of others, while the more subtle form of that sin is excited by the gifts and distinctions which grace confers upon others.—Many of those who were first, etc. In what respect? 1. With reference to the various periods of the Christian Church; 2. with reference to age; 3. with reference to gifts, office, etc.; 4. with reference to their own opinion.—All who regard themselves as the first, etc.—A Christian should regard everything as of free grace: the labor, the blessing, and the reward.—This passage may well be quoted in opposition to the Popish doctrine of works, but also against Protestant Antinomianism.

K. Zimmermann:—On what principle does our heavenly Father reward His people? 1. Not arbitrarily; 2. according to the law of justice; 3. according to the law of grace; 4. how justice and grace are here combined.—*Arndt* (*Gleichnisse*):—Humility in reference to the future reward.—*Hofacker*:—On the invitation of God to labor in His vineyard.—*Goldmann* (*Erweckungen*, 1835):—The characteristic marks of those who are chosen.—*Reinhardt*:—A mercenary spirit in the practice of what is right.—*Haupt*:—Haste into the vineyard: the Lord calls, time flies, the reward beckons.—*Kuinoel*:—The economy of the kingdom of grace.—*Niemann*:—How does our labor become a service in the kingdom of God.—*Lisco*:—He is the humblest Christian who has received most grace.—*Ahlfeld*:—Evening and its reward.—*Florey*:—The grace of the Lord is manifest in the case of all the laborers in His vineyard: 1. The call a call of grace; 2. the hour an hour of grace; 3. the labor a labor of grace; 4. the reward a reward of grace.—*Uhle*:—The season of grace in our lives.—*Rautenberg*:—God will give to every one according to his works.—*Bomhard*:—Meditation on the eleventh hour: 1. It is an hour of grace; 2. a solemn hour; 3. an uncertain hour; 4. a well-marked hour; 5. a difficult hour; 6. a blessed hour.

[*Trench*:—The great question on the last day will be, not "How much hast thou done?" but "What art thou now?" (Yet that which men have *done* will greatly affect what they *are*, since actions form habits and habits establish a character.)—*D. Brown*:—1. True Christianity is a life of active service rendered to Christ. 2. God rewards us for this service, though not of merit, but of pure grace. 3. There is a reward common to all laborers, and special rewards for peculiar services. 4. Unreasonable and ungrateful conduct of the murmuring laborers, and the rebuke administered to them on the day of account. 5. Encouragement for those called at a late hour. 6. Strange revelations of the judgment day: some of the first will be last, some of the last first, and some of the greatest note in the church below, will be excluded altogether.—Comp. also *Barnes*, *Notes in loc.*, who derives nine lessons from this parable too long to be quoted.—*Stier*:—The greatest man of business on the market-place of the world is a mere idle gazer (ver. 3: *standing idle*).—*W. Nast*:—Whoever has not yet commenced to labor in the kingdom of God, is an idler, no matter what else he may do.—The labor in the kingdom of God and its reward: 1. All are called to labor, though at different hours (in childhood, manhood, or old age). 2. God is just toward all laborers. 3. The reward is of free grace.—P. S.]

PART FOURTH.

CHRIST surrendering Himself to and for the Messianic Faith and Hope of His People.

CHAPTER XX. 17-XXIV. 1.

Historical Succession.—A second time Christ is now induced to leave Peræa by a message from Bethany, to the effect that Lazarus was sick. We account for the delay in His departure, in consequence of which He found His friend dead and buried, by the abundant work which lay to His hands in Peræa. Then followed the raising of Lazarus (John xi. 1–44). The definite resolution of the Sanhedrin to kill Jesus, expressed in the formal sentence of excommunication which they now pronounced, induced Him to retire into the city of Ephraim, which lay a few hours north of Jerusalem, near Bethel, and in the immediate vicinity of the wilderness of Judæa. Once more that wilderness was to afford Him shelter until the next paschal feast. Similarly, He had retired into the desert for a while after His baptism, because He was met by the spurious Messianic expectations of His people, as by a temptation. But now He withdrew, before fully surrendering Himself to those hopes of His people and followers which had been evoked by His own word and teaching. From Ephraim Jesus went to Jericho, where He joined the festive caravan of His friends, coming from Galilee and Peræa.

The history of Christ's sufferings, which now follows, may be regarded as that of His self-surrender to the Messianic faith of His people, which He had purified and sanctified in those who were Israelites indeed. The long-expected hour had arrived. In the most general sense, or viewing it in connection with the whole evangelical history, this period may be said to continue until His death. But, for the sake of greater distinctness, it may be arranged into the days of the Hosanna, and those of the cry: "Crucify Him;" or, the period of enthusiastic reception, and that of determined rejection. In the Gospel of Matthew, the period of suffering and the report of the last discourses of our Lord are very distinctly marked; while at the close of that section we have Christ's farewell to the temple, and His final judgment upon the Pharisees and scribes. Accordingly, the part under consideration constitutes a well-marked, although very brief, period of the highest importance. It may be designated as the period of triumphant progress, or of the Hosanna. Its contents are arranged under the following sections.

FIRST SECTION.

THE FULL PROPHETIC ANTICIPATION OF THE END.

CHAPTER XX. 17-19.

17 And Jesus going up to Jerusalem took the twelve disciples[1] apart in the way, and
18 said [and in the way said][2] unto them, Behold, we go up to Jerusalem; and the Son
of man shall [will] be betrayed [delivered] unto the chief priests and unto the scribes,
19 and they shall [will] condemn him to death,[3] And shall [will] deliver him to the Gentiles to mock, and to scourge, and to crucify *him*:[4] and the third day he shall rise [will be raised] again.[5]

[1] Ver. 17.—Tischendorf omits μαθητάς after D., L., Z., al. Lachmann retains it, and Meyer accounts for the omission from the parallel passages. [Tischendorf likewise retains it in his edit. septima critica major of 1859. Dr. Lange seems to have used the smaller critical edition of 1849, which omits μαθητάς.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 17.—[The Vatican and Sinait. Codd., and the Codd. L., Z. (which generally agree with the former), and the critical editions of Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Alford read: καὶ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ, instead of ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ, καί,

as the Received Text has it. Dr. Lange for internal reasons prefers here the latter, which is supported by Codd. A., C., D., and other uncial MSS.—P. S.]

[3] Ver. 18.—Cod. B. omits θανάτῳ, but it is required by the connection. [Cod. Sinait. reads: εἰς θάνατον.—P. S.]

[4] Ver. 19.—[Conant: "*to mock, and scourge, and crucify* (omitting '*to*' twice); the proper expression of the Greek εἰς τό with the three following *infinitives*. The interpolated '*him*' is superfluous and enfeebles the expression."—P. S.]

[5] Ver. 19.—The *Recepta* [and Lachmann, following B., C., D.]: ἀναστήσεται. Tischendorf [and Alford]: ἐγερθήσεται, after C*., L., Z. The former reading seems to have arisen from the parallel passages, according to Meyer. It may be urged in favor of ἐγερθήσεται, that it sets forth the restitution of the Messiah by the Almighty power of God in contrast with His rejection by the people. [Cod. Sinait. reads here εγερθησετε, for -ται,—one of the many writing errors of this ancient MS.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 17. **Took the twelve disciples apart.**—The expression παρέλαβεν is intended as an antithesis to καὶ προσλαβόμενος αὐτὸν ὁ Πέτρος in ch. xvi. 22, although the terms are not quite the same. On the latter occasion Peter rebuked the Lord, and in his earnestness actually took hold of Him, to arrest His progress; while Jesus took the Twelve apart into retirement. There He entered into full explanations about the decease which He was to accomplish; thus giving the disciples another opportunity of deciding whether, by an act of free and full self-surrender, they would follow Him, or not.

Apart, κατ' ἰδίαν.—This expression has a profound meaning in the life of Jesus. In all probability, it does not merely refer here to a turning aside from the multitude which had gathered around (Euthym. Zigab.: οὐκ ἔδει ταῦτα μαθεῖν τοὺς πολλούς, ἵνα μὴ σκανδαλισθῶσιν), but means, that Jesus retired into the wilderness of Ephraim. Comp. John xi. 54. Thence He afterward joined, at Jericho, the festive caravan which travelled from Galilee to Jerusalem. In the text, the Evangelist refers to the moment when He came out of the wilderness, and was about ("*in the way*," ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ) to join the festive train.

Vers. 18, 19. **Behold, we go up.**—The former predictions of His impending sufferings, in ch. xvi. 21 and xvii. 22, are now followed by a more detailed description of these events. Spiritually viewed, His sufferings consisted of a twofold betrayal, and that in the form both of rejection and of surrender: 1. παραδοθήσεται τοῖς ἀρχιερεῦσιν, κ.τ.λ.; 2. καὶ παραδώσουσι. With reference to the first betrayal, our Lord evidently indicates that He would Himself go forth from the midst of His followers, and that they would not prevent the impending events. But the betrayer himself is not yet named; the particulars being still withheld under the use of the passive mood. But the second act of betrayal is distinctly mentioned as the voluntary deed of the chief priests and scribes, or of the Sanhedrin,—in other words, of the professing people of God, in so far as they were represented by their supreme tribunal. His own followers were to betray and surrender Him into the hands of the Sanhedrin, while the Sanhedrin and the chosen people were to betray and to deliver Him to the Gentiles. Similarly, these two parties were to share in His death. For while the highest Jewish tribunal was to judge and to condemn Him to death, the Gentiles were to determine the accessories and the mode of His sufferings.—He was to be *mocked*, *scourged*, and *crucified*. When the apostasy and betrayal of the high priests had first been announced to the disciples, mention had not been made of most of these particulars. On the second occasion on which the Saviour intimated His sufferings, He spoke of being delivered, but only in general terms, as a betrayal into the hands of men. But on this occasion the disciples were informed of the twofold betrayal which was impending—on the part of His own friends into the hands of His enemies, and again on the part of the chosen race to the Gentiles. Similarly, the prediction of His death is now more definitely presented, with all the particulars connected with it. He who was *mocked* or treated with scorn (or designated as an impotent enthusiast), should not have been *scourged;* or, again, having been scourged (or designated as a common and ordinary transgressor), He should not have been *crucified* (or treated as a capital offender). But all these apparently conflicting modes of punishment were to be inflicted upon the Messiah, whom His people had betrayed and rejected.

Ver. 19. **And the third day.**—As the sun breaks through dark clouds, so does this promise here again shed its blessed light, comp. xvi. 21; xvii. 23. Still, it is not more fully explained, but left in general outline until after the paschal feast, when the Lord explained it more fully. The Evangelist does not directly record the effects of this prediction of Jesus. But the history of Salome, which immediately follows, clearly shows that, so far from having tended to cast down the disciples, it had only increased their courage. From Mark x. 32 we infer that even before that time they had been most deeply moved; while from Luke xviii. 34 we learn that, even after this express statement, they were not inclined to take the words of the Lord in their literal sense, as implying the terrible truth which they seemed to convey (*Leben Jesu*, ii. 2, 1148).

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

We note, first of all, the contrast between the first occasion on which Jesus had left the wilderness, at the commencement of His public ministry, and this time, when He again came forth at the close of His course. Then, the spurious and worldly expectations of His people concerning the kingdom drove Him into the wilderness, where He resolved to avoid and eschew that temptation, wherever and however it met Him. But now He is again drawn forth by the youthful and healthy, but weak faith of His followers, who go up to the feast. He comes forth from the wilderness, as if at the call of the Father, as the Messiah, to join them, and to realize their hopes. Again, the state of mind of the disciples, as compared with that of the Master, forms another striking contrast. They seem full of indefinite hopes and expectations; and the announcement that He should be crucified, only adds fresh fuel to the flame. The mention of the twofold betrayal that awaited Him has its deep and solemn meaning. Our Lord referred not merely to the fact, that His people and their rulers should deliver Him, their long expected Messiah, into the hands of the Gentiles, but also to the be-

trayal which awaited Him from among His own followers, in consequence of which He should be surrendered to the Sanhedrin. Thus Christ was betrayed not merely by the Old Testament community, but also by those who formed the circle of the New Testament disciples before they were enlightened by the pentecostal effusion of the Spirit. If the latter had not first delivered Him, the Jews could not so readily have seized and betrayed Him into the hands of the Gentiles.

[WORDSWORTH: Our Lord reveals the future by degrees, as His Apostles were able to bear it, and in proportion as He drew nearer to His passion. He had first told them that the Son of Man should be put to death, xvi. 21 (and more fully, xvii. 22, 23), and He had said that His disciples must take up the *cross* and *follow* Him, x. 38; xvi. 24; and thus He had prepared them gradually for the revelation which He now makes toward the close of His ministry, that *He Himself* should be delivered to the Romans to be mocked, and scourged, and crucified. How natural is all this! Here is one of the many silent proofs of the truth of the gospel history, as well as of the long-suffering, wisdom, and tenderness of Christ.—P. S.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The last and fullest prediction of the sufferings of the Lord, a great evidence,—1. of the prophetic character of the Lord; 2. of His willingness, as a Priest, to offer Himself a sacrifice unto the Father; 3. of His confident expectation of victory as a King.—How the faithfulness of the Lord toward His disciples appears in the announcement of His impending sufferings: 1. It is seen in the gradual manner in which He makes the fact known (from the first He had intimated that His path was one of suffering; but, while putting an end to their spurious hopes, He had never said anything to cast them down). 2. But now He set it before them in all its terrors (He dealt candidly with them. Return was still possible for them, although, from their former decision, He no longer asked them whether they would forsake Him). 3. He placed before their view the promise awaiting them at the end; thus establishing and encouraging them by this blessed prospect.—How frequently the Lord takes His own people apart in His Church (to reveal great things to them, which others cannot yet bear or receive).—Deep and solemn importance at all times of the saying, "*Behold, we go up to Jerusalem.*"—The journey of the Messiah to Jerusalem: the saddest and yet the happiest event in history.—The fact of His impending sufferings so clearly present to His mind, and yet conveying so little terror: 1. The sufferings themselves,—(*a*) in their spiritual aspect: a twofold betrayal and a twofold rejection; (*b*) in their outward aspect: a twofold sentence—condemning Him as a heretic and as a criminal. 2. The effect on His own mind: (*a*) it did not affright Him (if it did, He would not have seen it; but because He saw it, it did not fill Him with fear); (*b*) it led Him to arrange His progress (to prepare both Himself and His people).—Deep mystery of the fact, that Israel delivered their long-expected Messiah into the hands of the hated Gentiles: 1. A mystery connected with their former sins; 2. with their impending judgments; 3. with the infinite compassion of the Lord.—The guilt of the world, the death of Christ.—How the sin of the world appears in the death of Jesus: (*a*) in the sin of the disciples toward their Lord and Master; (*b*) in the sin of the people toward their Messiah; (*c*) in the sin of the Gentiles toward the Son of Man.—How the Lord looked beyond and through His sufferings to the goal of His resurrection.—When the guilt of the world appears most fully, its reconciliation by the Messiah is also at hand.—In opposition to men, who crucified Christ, we have God, who raised Him up.—The Son of Man *will be delivered.* Import of this sad secret: 1. As yet, it is not more fully disclosed, because it is the saddest part of all. 2. It may not yet be disclosed, because it is to be the free act of the betrayer. 3. It need not be more fully disclosed, because the slightest hint should have proved a solemn warning to all.—How, in meditating on the sufferings of Christ, we are prone to think too little of the first and saddest betrayal, viz., that of His disciples.—The ecclesiastical and the historical aspect of this betrayal.—The threefold manifestation of the sin of the disciples as springing from offence at Him: (*a*) It was a betrayal; (*b*) a denial; (*c*) a forsaking.—"He that delivereth Me unto thee hath the greater sin." Import of this, as referring not merely to the second betrayal of Jesus on the part of His enemies, but also to the first by Judas Iscariot.—Contradictory character of the treatment which the Saviour experienced: 1. He was betrayed, and yet judicially condemned; 2. temporal and spiritual sentence was pronounced upon Him; 3. He experienced various and contradictory modes of punishment: scorn, scourging, crucifixion.—Why Christ saw His cross afar off: 1. It was predetermined from the beginning, and He saw it everywhere throughout His course; 2. from the first He prepared for it, and experienced its bitterness in many preliminary trials; 3. it was the harbinger of His exaltation, and ever and again He anticipated His coming glory.—The cross the perfect manifestation—1. of the guilt of the world; 2. of the love of Christ; 3. of His obedience; 4. of the grace of God.

Starke:—*Hedinger:* The sufferings of Christ our sufferings: (*a*) in respect of their imputation; (*b*) in respect of heir consequences; (*c*) in respect of the example set to us.—Let us learn to be ever mindful of our death and resurrection.

Heubner:—The anticipation of the glory awaiting Him, cherished by the human soul of Jesus, was the result of His full and deep faith. This expectation, however, did not detract either from the merit or from the intensity of His sufferings, just as a similar hope in the people of God does not make their contest more easy or less glorious.

SECOND SECTION.

THE PLACES AT THE RIGHT AND AT THE LEFT HAND OF HIS THRONE—AND OF HIS CROSS.

CHAPTER XX. 20–28.

(Mark x. 35–45.)

20 Then came to him the mother of Zebedee's children [of the sons of Z., τῶν υἱῶν Z.]
with her sons, worshipping *him*, and desiring [asking, αἰτοῦσα, comp. ver. 22] a certain
21 thing [something][1] of him. And he said unto her, What wilt thou? She saith unto
him, Grant [Command][2] that these my two sons may [shall] sit, the one on thy right
22 hand, and the other on the left, in thy kingdom. But Jesus answered and said, Ye
know not what ye ask [αἰτεῖσθε]. Are ye able to drink of the cup that I shall drink of,
and to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?[3] They say unto him,
23 We are able. And he saith unto them, Ye shall drink indeed of my cup, and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with:[3] but to sit on my right hand, and on
my left, is not mine to give, but *it shall be given to them* [but it is for those] for whom
24 it is prepared of [by] my Father. And when the ten heard *it*, they were moved with
25 indignation[4] against the two brethren [brothers]. But Jesus called them *unto him*, and
said, Ye know that the princes [rulers, ἄρχοντες] of the Gentiles [nations] exercise dominion [lordship, κατακυριεύουσιν] over them, and they that are great exercise authority
26 upon them. But it shall not be so [But not so is it, οὐχ οὕτως δὲ ἐστίν][5] among you:
but whosoever will be [would become, θέλῃ γενέσθαι] great among you, let him be your
27 minister [διάκονος]; And whosoever will be chief [would be first, θέλῃ εἶναι πρῶτος]
28 among you, let him be your servant [δοῦλος]: Even as the Son of man came not to be
ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for [ἀντί] many.[6]

[1] Ver. 20.—[Dr. Lange adds in small type and in parenthesis: *a royal favor*, following Maldonatus and Fritzsche who find in τι *aliquid magni*, by way of anticipation. *See* his *Exeg. Notes.*]

[2] Ver. 2.—[So Conant, who correctly observes that εἰπέ has here the sense of authoritative direction, as in ch. iv. 3: "*Command that these stones be made bread*," and in Luke x. 40: "*Bid her therefore that she help me.*" Lange: *Sprich's aus.*—P. S.]

[3] Vers. 22, 23.—The words: καὶ τὸ βάπτισμα, ὃ ἐγὼ βαπτίζομαι, βαπτισθῆναι in ver. 22, and the corresponding addition: καὶ . . . . βαπτισθήσεσθε in ver. 23, are wanting in Codd. B., D., L., Z. [and in Cod. Sinait., which belongs to the same class of MSS.], and in many ancient versions [and in all critical editions]. They were in all probability inserted from the parallel passages in Mark x. 38, 39.

[4] Ver. 24.—[Or: *were much displeased*, ἠγανάκτησαν, as the verb is rendered Mark x. 14, 41, and by Conant in this place.—P. S.]

[5] Ver. 26.—Lachmann, with B., D., L., Z., and other authorities, reads: ἐστίν. So also Meyer: "The *Recepta* ἔσται is a change with the view to conform it to vers. 26 and 27, where ἔσται occurs twice (instead of ἔστω, Fritzsche), according to Lachmann and the preponderance of authorities." [Tischendorf reads ἔσται in ver. 26, and afterward twice: ἔστω. Cod. Sinait. twice: εστε.—P. S.]

[6] Ver. 28.—[Codd. D., Z., al., have a lengthy apocryphal addition to this verse, which resembles Luke xiv. 8 sqq. *See* the critical apparatus in Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford; also the Com. of Meyer, p. 375.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 20. **Then came to Him the mother of the sons of Zebedee.**—Salome (comp. Mark xv. 40; xvi. 1; Matt. xxvii. 56), who must accordingly be regarded as the wife of Zebedee. Most of the ancient traditions assume that she was the daughter of Joseph by a previous marriage; while others suggest that she had been the wife of Joseph, by whom he was the father of two daughters; lastly, some regarded her as a niece of Zachariah the priest, the father of John the Baptist. But a correct interpretation of John xix. 25 (*see* WIESELER, *Studien und Kritiken*, 1840, iii.) shows that she was the sister of Mary the mother of Jesus. Accordingly, James the Elder and John were cousins of Jesus, and Salome His aunt. The relationship subsisting between them might seem to lend additional support to the claims of Salome, based as they were upon the friendship subsisting between the Lord and John, and on the general position occupied by the sons of Zebedee. A twofold meaning attaches to the word τότε, *then*. It refers, in the first place, to the moment when, in company with His disciples, Jesus came forth from the wilderness of Ephraim, and joined the first caravan of festive pilgrims. Probably this band consisted of the more intimate friends and followers of Jesus, who had journeyed directly from Galilee to Ephraim through Samaria, and from thence passed with the Lord to Jericho, where they met the larger caravan coming from Galilee, which had travelled through Peræa. In that company was the ardent and daring mother of the sons of Zebedee. Evident-

ly she had not been with them in the wilderness of Ephraim. Her sons had probably communicated what had passed, and she now advanced the request mentioned in the text. Meyer suggests that she may have heard from her sons what Jesus had promised to the Apostles in ch. xix. 28. No doubt she had been informed of the announcement of His impending sufferings; and this circumstance enables us to appreciate the deeper import of the word τότε. It was immediately after that fearful declaration on the part of Jesus, concerning His impending crucifixion, that she came forward with the request, that her sons should occupy the most prominent positions in His kingdom. The circumstances under which this prayer was urged, go to a certain extent to excuse its boldness, and to deprive it of the unfavorable impression which it would otherwise produce, as if Salome had wished to advance her sons at the expense of Peter. Viewed in this light, there is even something sublime and heroic in what she says. In the midst of such gloomy prospects she seems to raise the standard of highest hope, while she expresses her confident anticipation that in the approaching contest her children would be found by the side of Jesus, and sharing in the greatest dangers. But while admitting all that is noble, there is a sad want of humble surrender to the word of the Lord.

Worshipping Him, and asking a certain thing of Him.—While Matthew represents Salome as interceding for her sons, Mark puts the request into the mouth of the sons themselves. The two accounts supplement each other. Mark lays stress on the fact, that the request of the mother was prompted by her children,—a circumstance which is implied in the indignation of the other Apostles against the two brothers, mentioned by Matthew in ver. 24. On the other hand, our Gospel alludes more particularly to the form in which the request was actually made, the noble aspirations of the mother leading her to sympathize with the desire of her sons. The manner in which this prayer is urged is very significant. Salome seems the first to acknowledge the Lord as Messiah the King. Falling down before Him, she worships Him. At the same time she requests a certain thing of Him; *i. e.*, according to a frequent custom in Eastern courts, she entreats His unconditional consent to what she is about to ask (*see* 1 Kings ii. 20). The comment of Meyer, that αἰτοῦσά τι means, *as one that made a request*, is flat. But while it may be somewhat anticipating, with Scultetus, Maldonatus, and Fritzsche to regard τί as implying *aliquid magni*, it certainly conveys that she was about to urge a petition which she would fain have accorded before actually uttering it. But the reply of the Lord obliged her to express her wish in distinct language.

Ver. 21. **Command that, or, Say that:** εἰπὲ ἵνα.—This form of her address tends to present it in a more favorable light. She seems to imply that in point of fact the matter was already decided, and that it now only required a formal declaration on the part of Jesus to have it legally established. What she requested was, that her sons might occupy the two highest places in the kingdom of the Messiah. In the East, the highest place of honor was at the right hand of the king; and next to it, that on the left (Joseph. *Antiq.* vi. 11, 9. Thus Jonathan and Abner are seated beside Saul, and the Talmud represents the Messiah and Abraham as placed beside God). According to human views of the matter, it needs no special apology, that even "the gentle and meek John should have cherished such a desire" (Meyer). If an arrangement like this had been made, John would, personally, not have gained much; for, considering that James was the elder brother, his could only have been the place at the left hand,—a distinction which would not have been withheld, even if the first place had been accorded to Peter. In fact, as matters actually were, John already occupied a higher place than this. But it is scarcely necessary to say that the views and hopes of John had still to be purified and cleared by the cross, and spiritually elevated at Pentecost.

[LUTHER: "The flesh ever seeks to be glorified before it is crucified; exalted before it is abased."—P. S.]

Ver. 22. **Ye know not what ye ask.**—Different views are entertained of this reply. De Wette explains it: Your request arises from an incorrect view of the character of My kingdom, which is spiritual. Meyer paraphrases: Ye know not that the highest posts in My kingdom cannot be obtained without sufferings such as I have to endure. We explain it (comp. *Leben Jesu*, ii. 3, 1150): They had no idea what fearful honors they would have obtained if their desire had been granted. They would have occupied the place of the two malefactors who were crucified with Jesus. Truly, ye know not what ye ask! The Lord thus replied, in mercy and compassion toward that ignorance, in consequence of which His beloved disciples too frequently seek for themselves what would be dangerous, and even destructive—and, perhaps still more frequently, what is unbecoming. The rebuke of Christ was not merely directed against the ignorance which led them to covet the place of the two malefactors, but also against the presumptuous selfishness which made them forget the other disciples. Still, the answer of the Lord shows that He also had regard to that noble feeling which prompted them to desire a share in His impending sufferings.

Are ye able to drink of the cup? כּוֹס.—"A metaphorical designation for fate in general, and more especially for sufferings; Gesenius on Isa. li. 17; Knobel on Isa. p. 355." Meyer. But the term is here purposely chosen, with an allusion, on the one hand, to the cup on the royal table, and, on the other, to the cup of sufferings (Matt. xxvi. 39). The same twofold import attaches to the expression βάπτισμα in the parallel passage in the Gospel of Mark. It may signify a festive bath, but also the baptism of blood which awaited the Lord. Hence the term at the same time expressed the views of the Apostles, and those of the Lord Himself.

We are able, δυνάμεθα.—The sons of Zebedee now come forward in their own names. As from the first they had intended to express their readiness to undergo the deepest sufferings for the sake of the kingdom of heaven, in which they coveted the first places, they now declare their assent to the view set before them by the Lord, that the royal cup must, in the first place, be a cup of suffering—His kingly bath a baptism of blood. Accordingly, they express their willingness to suffer with Christ. But this statement implied an over-estimate of their own strength, or rather a want of knowledge of their weakness and impotence which afterward became manifest during the night of Christ's betrayal. Still it cannot be questioned that they were the most courageous among the disciples, as appears from John's going into the high priest's palace without

denying His master, and from the fact that James was the first martyr of Christ.

Ver. 23. **Ye shall drink indeed of My cup.**—Our Lord does not discuss the question, how far they were capable of bearing suffering. The great question connected with the sufferings of the cross was not one of human heroism, or of the capability of endurance, but of inward, divine, and holy preparation. As yet the two disciples were incapable of making this distinction. Hence the Lord declined their sharing His sufferings in the former sense; while at the same time He pointed forward to the period when they should have part in them, in the higher and only true sense (the future tense is here used by way of antithesis to the present moment). The reply of Christ must therefore be regarded in the light of a correction implying an admission of their calling to suffer with Him; the fact of their being at present unable, in the spiritual sense, to share in His sufferings, being graciously presented in the form of an affirmation that the time for this should arrive. The admission to which we refer is all the more fully made, that the Lord has to add, "*But to sit on My right hand, and on My left,*" etc. This fellowship of suffering with Christ appeared more distinctly in the case of James than in that of any other of the Apostles. And although John died a natural death, at a very advanced age (*see* the article in the different Encyclopæ.; the Histories of the Apostolic Age, and the Fathers, Irenæus, ii. 22, 5; Eusebius, iii. 23, etc.), yet in a spiritual sense his was the longest and deepest martyrdom among the Apostles,—not to speak of the fact, that for the sake of Christ he underwent many and severe outward sufferings. Meyer correctly observes, that the apocryphal legend, to the effect that John had emptied a cup of poison without sustaining any harm, may probably have been derived from a misinterpretation of this passage.

[Wordsworth: "Our Lord here describes the two kinds of Christian martyrdom; and all Christians must be prepared for one or the other of them. Every one must be a James or a John." Similarly Pope Gregory, who distinguishes the *martyrium in mente*, and the *martyrium in mente et actione*, so that we may become martyrs, and yet, like St. John, die a natural death.—P. S.]

But to sit on My right hand, etc.—Different views have been taken of this difficult passage: 1. Chrysostom, Castellio, Grotius, and others, regard the word ἀλλά as used instead of εἰ μή, *except*,—*i. e.*, it does not become Me to bestow it upon others than those to whom it is granted.* To this de Wette objects—(*a*) that this is incompatible with the real meaning of οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμόν; (*b*) that the word ἀλλά implies an antithesis. At any rate the meaning would be unsuitable. 2. Augustine interprets: It is not Mine, in My capacity as man. 3. Bengel paraphrases: Before My exaltation by suffering. 4. Fritzsche remarks: The Father has prepared the kingdom (ch. xxv. 34); to which de Wette replies, that Christ was certainly the Founder and Ruler of the kingdom. 5. De Wette attempts to combine the views of Augustine and Bengel, and holds that Jesus here speaks of Himself as the human individual who was destined to be the Messiah, but had not yet been perfected as such. But in that case Christ would have expressed it: It is not *yet* Mine, but will be so at a future period. 6. Meyer holds that the Messianic administration of Christ was not strictly absolute, but limited by His relationship toward the Father. 7. My own view is thus expressed in the *Leben Jesu*, iii. 2, 1151: "The statement refers not merely to the dispensation of an earthly fate, which cometh from the Father, and according to which two malefactors were to be crucified with Christ, but also especially to the eternal predestination of eternal positions in the kingdom of God." In other words, Christ here distinguishes between the economy of the Father—creation, and its ideal basis, election to different degrees of glory—and the economy of the Son, or redemption, and an official call to labor in the vineyard. The prominent positions in the kingdom of God depend on certain relationships connected with original creation, and are not bestowed in consequence of office. This explanation is not inconsistent with the fact of a correspondence between chosen spirits and their official position in the kingdom, far less does it imply that the Sons of Thunder did not occupy a high place in the kingdom of Christ. But it conveyed the truth, that this position was not a part of the work of redemption (which was designed only to realize and to manifest the mystery of election)—far less that it depended on official position in the kingdom of Christ. The statement of the Lord thus serves as an introduction to what immediately follows. Spiritual aristocracy must prove its claims by humility, greatness by littleness, and the highest exaltation by the deepest self-abasement. The place which each of us is to hold in the eternal kingdom, is the result of our eternal destination, and intimately connected with the state of our minds and hearts.—**For whom it is prepared,** οἷς ἡτοίμασται.—That question has been decided before the foundation of the world.

Ver. 24. **And when the ten heard it,** ἠγανάκτησαν, **they became indignant,** or, **were much displeased.**—Not in the sense of holy indignation, but as partaking of the same spirit of ambition which had prompted the request. It deserves notice that on this occasion Peter does not seem to have prominently come forward. Of course, we do not mean that he formed an exception to the others. They all shared the same jealousy and indignation, as appears from the general tenor of the rebuke of the Lord. [*The ten*, including St. Matthew,* who here records his own weakness together with that of his colleagues, as St. Peter recommends the epistles of his brother Paul (2 Pet. iii. 15, 16), in one of which his own inconsistency is severely censured (Gal. ii. 11). A proof of humility and truthfulness.—P. S.]

Ver. 25. **The rulers of the nations.**—The expression τῶν ἐθνῶν in this passage does not refer exclusively to the *Gentiles*. Luther: Secular princes. Κατακυριεύουσιν, κατεξουσιάζουσιν. In this instance the two verbs have the additional meaning of pride and violence, which κατακυρ. has in 1 Pet. v. 3; Ps. v. 5, 10; although the word may also simply mean, *to bear rule*. But from the addition of the ἅπαξ λεγόμενον, κατεξουσ., we infer that it bears the meaning above indicated (similarly in Diod. Sicul. 14, 66).—De Wette suggests that οἱ

* [So also Alford, who translates ἀλλ' οἷς: *except to those for whom*.—Wordsworth explains: It is not for Me to *give*, but it is for Me to *adjudge;* it is not a boon to be gained by solicitation, but it will be assigned to those for whom it is *prepared*, according to certain laws prescribed by God.—P. S.]

* [Bengel: Decem. *In his ingenuus evangelista.*—P. S.]

ἄρχοντες refers to the kings, their substitutes and officers (in the Gospel of Mark the expression οἱ δοκοῦντες ἄρχειν is used with special allusion to the symbolical import and the legal validity of the secular power), and that οἱ μεγάλοι applies merely to the officers of state. Bengel explains the employment of the stronger verb in connection with οἱ μεγάλοι, because the latter are: *ipsis sæpe dominis imperiosiores.* As the term μεγάλοι primarily refers to persons great or powerful in themselves, perhaps the expression *princes* may allude to the legitimate rulers, and the term *great* to illegitimate usurpers and conquerors. Hence also the use of the stronger verb in the second clause.

Ver. 26. **But not so is it among you.**—The reading ἐστίν is very significant. Christ had already prepared them for this order of things, which was so different from that prevailing in the world. The order and succession in His kingdom was not to be settled according to any legal determination. Jesus had introduced a new and spiritual life, in direct opposition to secular monarchies and hierarchies. Hence also the reading of the future tense (ἔσται), instead of the imperative (ἔστω), is more suitable in the sentence next following.

Vers. 26, 27. **Whoever would become great.**—De Wette observes that μέγας = μέγιστος, and πρῶτος in the next clause. Meyer questions the correctness of this view, on the ground of the corresponding antithesis. Evidently, διάκονος corresponds to μέγας, and δοῦλος to πρῶτος. Comp. Matt. xviii. 1. In this instance, then, the "minister" and the "servant," or "slave," are intended as emblems of the greatness which the disciples should covet, even as formerly the little child set in the midst of them. In other words, deep humility appearing in service of love was to be the measure of their greatness.

Ver. 28. **Even as the Son of Man came not to be ministered to.**—In Matt. xviii. greatness was spoken of in the sense of dignity. Accordingly, Christ placed a little child in the midst of them, and ultimately appealed to His own example: "The Son of Man has come to seek that which was lost." But the greatness referred to in this passage refers to *rule or dominion.* Hence the Lord points His disciples to ministers or slaves; while He once more referred to His own work and mission, who "had come, not to be ministered to, *but to minister.*" The expression, "not to be ministered to," refers to all merely outward rule, whether in the shape of monarchy or hierarchy; in other words, to exercise authority over others for His own interest, for His own glory, or even by external means. Accordingly, the expression, **to minister,** applies to His submission or obedience. Viewing it in connection with its blessed motive, the passage implies: In His infinite love toward men, the Saviour has come to serve them; and He does so in obedience to the demands of the law and to the will of God, in order thus to redeem them. Hence the addition, **and to give His life;** which must be regarded as a further explanation, and indicates the *climax* of the service in which He was engaged. Comp. Phil. ii. 6: obedient—obedient unto death on the cross. The term *ministering* expresses the spirit of the life of Christ. His sufferings and death illustrated and displayed the submission of His whole course; they shed the fullest light on the object of His life. The Holy Servant of God surrendered His life; and that unto death (the ψυχή). He gave His life a **ransom** of life, λύτρον = כֹּפֶר; Exod. xxx. 12; Num. xxxv. 31; Prov. xiii. 8. This price of redemption He gave ἀντί, and not merely ὑπέρ, in the wider sense, *i. e.*, **instead of,** in exchange of, or as a substitute; Matt. xvii. 27; Heb. xii. 16. This redemption at the price of His life was made ἀντὶ πολλῶν. The expression **many** is not intended to indicate an exclusive minority, or a smaller number as compared with *all,*—for the latter expression occurs in Rom. v. 18; 1 Tim. ii. 4. The term is intended rather by way of antithesis to the *one* whose life was the ransom of the *many.* At the same time, it undoubtedly indicates not only the objective bearing, but also the subjective efficacy of this ransom, by which many (a great multitude) are in reality redeemed. Comp. Rom. v. 15; Matt. xxvi. 28.—The state from which these many are redeemed may readily be inferred from the figure employed. De Wette supplies—from death or from the misery of sin; Meyer—from eternal ἀπώλεια. Both commentators are right; but we would express their meaning more definitely. The death or the ἀπώλεια is here referred to as spiritual bondage or slavery. Comp. John viii. 34–36; Heb. ii. 14.

[Similarly Alford: "λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν is a plain declaration of the sacrificial and vicarious nature of the death of our Lord... It is here = ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων, 1 Tim. ii. 6. No stress should be laid on this word πολλῶν as not being πάντων here; it is placed in opposition to the *one* life which is given—the *one* for *many*—and not with any distinction from πάντων. Πάντων is the *objective,* πολλῶν the *subjective* designation of those for whom Christ died. He died *for all,* objectively; subjectively, the great multitude whom no man could number, πολλοί, will be saved by Him in the end."—P. S.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The Evangelists record three distinct instances in which the disciples seem to have contended for rank and position. (1) In Matt. xviii. 1, their dispute referred to the highest *dignity.* Then our Lord placed among them a little child, and taught them that He Himself watched over the little ones, and was the Shepherd of the lost. (2) In the passage under consideration, the reference seems more particularly to supreme *rule.* The Lord now directs them to the office of minister, and to the position of a slave; He Himself being that Holy Servant of God who had given Himself for the service of man, and redeemed them from the bondage of destruction, at the price of His own life. (3) According to Luke xxii. 24, another similar discussion took place during the celebration of the Eucharist. The Evangelist records, indeed, but few traits connected with this event. Still, even the circumstance that our Lord washed the feet of the disciples (John xiii.), shows that some occurrence of this kind must have taken place. Properly speaking, this service of love should have been performed by the master of the house. In this case he was not present; nor does any of the disciples seem to have been disposed to do it for the others. Contrary to the common custom, they were already seated at the table with unwashed feet, when the Lord Himself girt the linen towel about Him. From the words of Jesus, as recorded in Luke xxii. 27, we infer that this formed the commencement of another dispute. But, if the first discussion referred to pre

eminence of dignity, the second to pre-eminence of office and rule,—the third and last dispute probably referred to *personal* pre-eminence, or a higher place among those who were officially placed on the same level. But even this pre-eminence of personal (in opposition to official) position should give place to voluntary and mutual subordination, prompted by love.

2. "So long as this world shall, for its training, require secular authority and power, the Lord will, in His providence, raise up princes and great ones to administer rule and government. But the Apostles of the Lord were neither to imitate this rule, which was only intended for a preparatory state of things, nor to substitute their own domination in its stead, nor to attempt supplementing it." Comp. the remarks of James at the council in Acts xv. 21: "Moses has of old time in every city them that preach him;" in other words, the servants of Christ in the Church are not called upon to attend to the *legal* administration of the law: this is the business of the servants of Moses in the synagogue. Let us beware of confounding Moses and Christ, or the secular government and the ministry of the Church.

3. The statement of Christ, "Whoever among you would be great," etc., conveys, that the only *superiority of authority* in His kingdom is that which springs from the *service of love*, and the only *superiority of power* is that which appears in *ministering* to the Church. This, however, does not imply that there is to be no order of office in His Church. But it does convey that anything like difference of rank or tyranny over the Church is incompatible with the will of Christ, and that all ecclesiastical offices are to lead to spiritual services of love. They are intended to subserve and advance the liberty, not the bondage, of the Church. In other words, their tendency is to be toward freedom. It is otherwise with the rule of this world, whether it appear in the form of monarchy or of hierarchy. Every hierarchy requires, more or less, the aid of despotism, and in fact contains the germ of it; while despotism always relies on the support of a hierarchy, or else itself attempts to exercise hierarchical domination over the conscience. Hence also these powers will at last become the instruments of the kingdom of darkness (*see* the corresponding passages in Dan. and Rev.; also 1 Pet. i. 18, 19). From all such powers of the world, Christ has redeemed the souls of His people. Hence it were the grossest self-contradiction to attempt introducing the forms of this bondage into the administration of the kingdom of grace.

[ORIGEN: As all carnal things are done by compulsion, but spiritual things by free-will, so those rulers who are spiritual ought to rest their power in the love of their subjects, not in their fears.—CHRYSOSTOM: High place courts him who flies from it, and shuns him who courts it. . . . Men become masters in this world that they may exercise domination over their inferiors, and reduce them to slavery, and rob them, and employ them even to death for their own profit and glory. . . . But men become governors in the Church that they may serve those who are under them, and minister to them whatever they have received of Christ, that they may postpone their own convenience, and mind that of others, and not refuse even to die for those beneath them. To seek therefore a command in the Church is neither righteous nor profitable. . . . How much soever you humble yourself, you cannot descend so far as did your Lord. (Translation taken from the Oxford edition of THOMAS AQUINAS' *Catena Aurea*, 1841, vol. i. part. ii. pp. 696, 697).—P. S.]

4. It admits of no question that the word ἀντί in the text implies a vicarious atonement or redemption by a substitute. Still, viewed in its connection, the passage primarily refers to redemption in the narrower sense, and not to the *atonement* itself. The following three elements may be distinguished in the work of redemption: 1. The καταλλαγή, which may be called the *prophetic* element in redemption; or, the announcement of the grace of God, and its sealing by the death of Christ, 2 Cor. v. 18, 19. Klaiber, Stier, and others, even in our own day, do not go beyond this. 2. The ἱλασμός, 1 John ii. 2; iv. 10: the atonement or propitiation; or, the *high-priestly* act of redemption, wrought out when Christ gave Himself a sacrifice to the judgment of God pronounced upon the ancient world, thereby converting that judgment into salvation. Anselm has developed this idea, although not with sufficient clearness in the distinction of terms. 3. The ἀπολύτρωσις, Rom. iii. 24; 1 Cor. i. 30; Eph. i. 14: the redemption of man from the bondage of destruction by the λύτρον of the blood of Christ; or, the *royal* act of redemption, which Christ accomplished when He surrendered His life to the powers of the world and to the power of darkness, thereby redeeming Himself and His people from the rulers of darkness, 1 Pet. i. 18, 19; Acts x. 38; xxvi. 18. The older Fathers chiefly dwelt on the last-mentioned element, as constituting redemption. During the Middle Ages exclusive stress was laid on the priestly element (to which Athanasius and Gregory of Naz. were the first prominently to call attention); while of late, theologians have chiefly insisted on the prophetical element in redemption. The defect of all these systems consists in their not distinguishing, and at the same time combining, all the three elements in the work of redemption. In Scripture they are generally presented more or less combined under one aspect (*see* the author's "*Positive Dogmatik*," pp. 858 and 893). Still, one or other of these elements is generally referred to in a more peculiar manner. Thus, in the passage under consideration, there is special reference to the royal office of Christ in redemption which He accomplished in the form of a servant. He gave His life as a ransom to redeem mankind from the power of darkness and to make us His own property. Hence the office of publishing this work of redemption was not to be transformed into a rule over His free Church, 1 Cor. vii. 23. ("Least of all by cruel despotism and the shedding of the blood of His members.")

5. If there were any truth in the Romish doctrine of the primacy of Peter, our Lord would have given a very different reply to the sons of Zebedee. He would have said in effect: *You know that in Cæsarea Philippi I have already accorded the first place unto Peter.* But how different was the answer of Jesus!

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Salome and her sons; or, the difference between the noblest aspirations of mere natural enthusiasm and the spiritual courage of holy humility.—The projects of parents with reference to their children must be tried and purified in the light of the Lord.—Salome and her sons as compared with Mary and her sons, Matt. xii. 46.—Christ proving Himself the heavenly King at His first public recognition in that

character: 1. By His grace; 2. by His impartiality; 3. by the exercise of His prerogative (both in granting and in withholding); 4. by His holiness and justice (guarding and preserving the rights of the Father).—How the thoughts of the Lord are infinitely high above the thoughts even of His people.—Christ both correcting and offering up our petitions.—Ye know not what ye ask; or, the ignorance and the dangers connected with many of our dearest earthly wishes, as illustrated by the request of the sons of Zebedee: 1. They sought the place of the two malefactors; 2. they requested, so to speak, something which had only existence in their imagination (worldly honors in the kingdom of Christ); 3. they sought something which, in its higher import, had already been given away—perhaps to themselves, perhaps to others—viz., special degrees of election.—The threefold administration in the economy of God.—How Christ in His administration always shed a glorious light on that of the Father.—The work of redemption completing that of creation.—"When the ten heard it;" or, how ambition* and jealousy frequently evoke each other even in the Church of Christ.—The second dispute about pre-eminence among the disciples.—Its relation to the first and the third disputes.—"Jesus called them unto Himself;" or, the teaching of Christ concerning the character of hierarchy, as addressed to the first council of His disciples.—Secular government in its relation to ecclesiastical order: 1. It is recognized without being approved in every particular; 2. it cannot serve as a model for the Church of Christ, or be adopted in the form of a hierarchy; 3. far less may it exercise rule over the Church itself (Cæsaropapacy).—How the government of the Church of Christ must be a ministry in the strictest sense: 1. He that is not willing to be a minister has no place in it; 2. every genuine minister will be great in proportion as he *serves;* 3. if we are willing to be servants or slaves in this house, *i. e.*, to devote ourselves, body and soul, to its interests, we shall be first.—Only that arrangement has the approbation of the Lord which combines order with liberty in the Church.—The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, etc.; or, the Church is to be formed according to the model which Christ set before us in His life and death.—How Christ's humiliation condemns the ambition of those who call themselves His servants.—No tyranny over the conscience may interpose between Christ, the kingly Redeemer, and His royal bride, the Church.—Christ has redeemed His people with His precious blood *from*, not *to*, the bondage of this world.—"Ye are bought with a price; be ye not the servants of men."—As every other association or body, so the Church has its appropriate organization, corresponding to its nature. Thus the plant would die if it were subject to the conditions of the crystal; the animal, if it were subject to those of the plant; man, if he were subject to those of the animal; and the kingdom of heaven, if subject to those of the world. Or rather, the plant has burst through the conditions of the crystal, and passed beyond it, etc.; and the kingdom of heaven through the conditions and forms of this world.—They would fain have established an order in the Church, by which the forms of an unredeemed world would have been forced upon the redeemed: 1. They would have attempted to present spiritual life under shadows and in emblems; 2. knowledge and spiritual power under law and tradition; 3. redemption or liberty under constraint; 4. spiritual blessedness under force and restraint.—How the sufferings of Christ on the cross have given a right form and order to His kingdom: 1. They have converted the lowest depth into the most glorious height (reproach into honor, sorrow into well-being, service into dignity, apparent weakness into power). 2. They have subjected to His sway all the powers of the world (banished secular authority from the Church, and exalted Him to be the King of kings, and Lord of lords, Rev. i. 5).

On the two preceding sections combined.—The difference between the Lord's prospect and that of His disciples: He sees the cross where they see thrones of honor; He sees the resurrection and eternal life, where they see only night and darkness.—The human nobility in the aspiration of the sons of Zebedee: the good in it (they express an unlimited hope in the Lord's cause, and would forever unite their destiny with His); the evil in it (they over-estimate their enthusiasm, and approach too nearly a violation of the obedience due to the Lord, and the love due to their fellow-disciples).—The glance at the Lord's cross sanctifies the wish of the disciples.

Starke:—*Cramer:* Christian parents! seek not too lofty things for your children.—*Zeisius:* It is not only vain, but also most foolish, to seek from Christ temporal honor and glory.—It seems as if Christ here (by the cup and the baptism) had referred to the two great sacraments of the New Testament, which bind us to the imitation of Christ.—*Quesnel:* The weakness of man betrays itself even in his prayers, Rom. viii. 26.—First the suffering, then the crown, 1 Pet. iv. 13.—*Osiander:* Every Christian has his portion of tribulation assigned: let him take it as a salutary cup and healthy medicine.—The best men may make great mistakes as to the extent of their ability.—Lord Jesus! make me worthy to drink of Thy cup, and then place me where Thou wilt.—*Canstein:* One offence soon draws others after it (then were the ten displeased).—In the kingdom of Christ there are only ministers, servants, and brethren.—O how far is the external Church fallen from this purity!—*Langii Opus:* This declaration throws the whole papistical hierarchy to the ground.—*Quesnel:* Preachers must serve after the example of Christ.

Gerlach:—A warning to all in the Church who are higher than others, that they should remember the foundation of their power; lest it should be mere empty form, ruinous to themselves and the Church.

Heubner:—The sons of Adam gladly bow down when worldly honor is to be attained.—Vain maternal love often leads greatly astray.—*To sit on Thy right hand:* how much disposed the heart is to make religion the means of furthering worldly interests.—The higher a man looks, the greater the danger.—To partake of the highest honor with Jesus is to suffer with Him.—He who knows nothing of the cup of Christ's passion will have no part in the cup of joy.—Hence we see how ambition exasperates others against us.—Wouldest thou rule, learn first to serve.

* [Not: *reverence*, as the Edinb. translator has it, who thoughtlessly read: *Ehrfurcht* for *Ehrsucht* (*und Eifersucht*), and thus made Lange responsible for the nonsense that a fundamental virtue begets an evil passion and *vice versâ*.—P. S.]

[With this chapter closes Mr. EDERSHEIM's translation in the Edinb. edition. The remaining chapters of the Commentary on St. Matthew were translated by the Rev. W. B. POPE (or some inferior assistants), as we learn from a note on the back of the title-page to vol. ii.—P. S.]

THIRD SECTION.

THE WRETCHED KEPT BACK FROM THE LORD, THE KING OF MERCY.

CHAPTER XX. 29–34.

(Mark x. 46–52; Luke xviii. 35–43; xix. 1–10.)

29 And as they departed from [were going out of] [1] Jericho, a great multitude followed
30 him. And, behold, two blind men sitting by the way side, when they heard that Jesus
passed by [was passing by, παράγει], cried out, saying, Have mercy on us, O Lord, *thou*
31 Son of David [Lord, have mercy on us, Son of David]. [2] And the multitude rebuked
them, because [that, ἵνα] they should hold their peace: but they cried the more, saying,
Have mercy on us, O Lord, *thou* Son of David [Lord, have mercy on us, Son of Da-
32 vid]. [2] And Jesus stood still, and called them, and said, What will ye that I shall do
33, 34 unto [for] you? They say unto him, Lord, that our eyes may be opened. So Je-
sus had compassion *on them*, and touched [Then Jesus, moved with compassion, touched,
σπλαγχνισθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰσ. ἥψατο] their eyes: and immediately their eyes [they] [3] received
sight, and they followed him.

[1] Ver. 29.—[The strict rendering of ἐκπορευομένων αὐτῶν. In Mark x. 46 the E. V. has: *As he went out of Jericho.* Luke says (xviii. 35): *As he was come nigh unto Jericho.* On this chronological discrepancy between Matthew and Luke, *see* the *Exeg. Notes* on ver. 30.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 30.—[*Text. rec.:* Ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, κύριε, υἱὸς Δαβίδ. But the best authorities read: Κύριε, ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, υἱὸς Δαυείδ, *Lord, have mercy on us, Son of David.* Cod. Sinait. reads in ver. 30: ελεησον ημας ιησου υιε Δ., and in ver. 31: κυριε ελεησον ημας υιε Δ.—P. S.]

[3] Ver. 34.—The words: αὐτῶν οἱ ὀφθαλμοί (*their eyes*) after ἀνέβλεψαν are wanting in Codd. B., D., L., Z., [and Cod. Sinait. which generally agrees with the Codd. just named], and in the Latin Vulgate. They are omitted by Lachmann and Tischendorf [not in the large ed. of 1859, where the words are retained. Alford omits them, but in his apparatus he neglects to notice the difference of reading.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Chronology.—According to John xii. 1, Jesus came to Bethany six days before the Passover. As the feast fell upon the 15th of Nisan, or began on the evening of the 14th, this note of time takes us back to the 9th of Nisan. The day of the crucifixion was the 15th; * and therefore the 9th was the Sabbath previous. The Jewish customs at the feast throw much light upon all these events. On Friday, the 8th of Nisan, in the year 783 from the foundation of Rome, or in the year 30 of our common reckoning (Wieseler, in his *Chronol. Synopse*, p. 176, shows that the first day of the Passover fell on a Friday in that year), Jesus went, with His disciples and some friends, from Ephraim to Jericho. Here He remained in the house of Zacchæus. Thus the procession set out too late to reach Jerusalem before sunset, that is, before the Sabbath. He therefore tarried, for the quiet observance of the festive day, in the customary tents near the Mount of Olives. Whether He spent the night in these tents, or in Bethany, cannot be decided,—at any rate, John dates from the next day; for on the evening of the next day, probably when the Sabbath was ended, that feast was prepared for Him in the house of Simon the leper, at which Martha served and Mary anointed Him, and to which many friends from Jerusalem had come to salute Him. On the following Sunday, early in the morning, the festal company set out from Bethany and from the tents, and assumed the form of a triumphant procession. After considering all these points, it will appear only an inexactness, and by no means a discrepancy, in the first three Evangelists to conduct the procession without any break from Jericho to Jerusalem, and to insert the anointing afterward: Matt. xxvi. 6; Mark xiv. 3. They had a definite motive for the transposition of this supplementary narrative of the anointing. It was their purpose to show how the idea of the betrayal ripened in the soul of Judas through the effect produced by the anointing; and also to connect the history of the anointing with the indication of the traitor at the Paschal feast. At the same time, they would bring the anointing as near as possible to the Supper, on account of its internal prophetical relation to that holy ordinance.

* [According to others, the 14th of Nisan. *See* Introduction to ch. xxvi. below.—P. S.]

Ver. 29. **And as they were going out of Jericho.**—Luke records the delay in Jericho, and the Lord's stay in the house of Zacchæus, ch. xix. 1; as also, the parable of the ten servants and the ten pounds, which was connected therewith. Jericho, יְרִיחוֹ , יְרֵחוֹ , יְרִיחֹה ; variously written in the Greek also. According to the first form, it signified "the fragrant city;" according to the second, "the city of the moon." The former, however, is the more probable derivation. It lay not far from the Jordan (60 stadia, or two hours), and was separated from Jerusalem by a waste and wretched wilderness.*

* [We have here corrected the original, which makes evidently a mistake (faithfully copied, as usual, in the Edinb. trsl.), by stating the distance of Jericho from *Jerusalem* (instead of *from Jordan*) to be two hours. According to WINER, *Bibl. Realwörterbuch*, i. p. 543 (3d ed.), and ROBINSON, *Palestine*, vol. i. p. 565, Jericho was 60 stadia west from the river Jordan, and 150 stadia east from Jerusalem; according to other statements, 5 English miles from the Jordan, and 18 or 20 miles east-north-east of Jerusalem. The difference arises in part from the uncertainty of the site of ancient Jeri-

It was in the tribe of Benjamin, on the borders of Ephraim. The district was a blooming oasis in the midst of an extended sandy plain, watered and fruitful, rich in palms, roses, and balsam: hence probably the name (from רֵיחַ, *scent, odor*). It is true that the poisonous serpent was not wanting in this paradise also. The city was built by the Canaanites, and taken and destroyed by Joshua (Josh. vi. 26). At a later date it was built again and fortified, and became the seat of a school of the prophets. Herod the Great beautified it, and at this time it was one of the most pleasant places in the land. The balsam trade required that a chief publican should be there; and it was also inhabited by priests and Levites. In the twelfth century scarcely a vestige of the place remained; there is now a wretched village, *Richa* or *Ericha*, with about 200 inhabitants. Robinson, however, locates the old Jericho in the neighborhood of the fountain of Elisha [two miles north-west of Richa]. The palms have all vanished, and the climate is hot and unhealthy. [Robinson: "Only a single palm-tree now remains of the 'City of Palms.'"—P. S.]

Ver. 30. **Two blind men sitting by the way side.**—Here occurs one of the most marked of the apparent discrepancies of the Gospels. According to Matthew, Jesus healed two blind men on departing; according to Mark, one blind man on departing; according to Luke, one blind man on entering the city. The older Harmonists assumed that there were two miracles: that one blind man was healed at the entrance, and two at the departure, of Christ; and that Mark gave prominence to Bartimæus as the better known of the two persons. Ebrard thinks that Matthew combined the two accounts of Mark and Luke, and placed them in the departure from the city. (So also Wieseler.) It may simplify the matter, if we consider that Jesus did not enter Jericho by the Jordan gate from Peræa, but came from Ephraim; and therefore, probably, made His exit by the same gate through which He entered. The blind man cried out upon Jesus, was threatened and restrained; he cried louder, and Jesus then regarded and healed him. But the Lord might have kept the blind man waiting till His return, to test him; and thus the Evangelists record the same event,—the one, however, connecting it with the entrance, the other with the exit.* Further, it is not difficult to suppose that in the interval another blind man joined company with the first, Bartimæus; and that both encouraged each other in the louder cry.

Ver. 31. **That** [not: *because*] **they should hold their peace.**—This is a feature of the narrative that could not have been invented. It marks the feeling of the great festal procession, which was disposed to regard the cry of these wretched blind men, at such an hour, as an impertinent interruption. It was as if a multitude of courtiers should strive to keep the interruption of misery from throwing a discordant element into a royal feast. Hence the tone is characteristically changed, when Jesus stood still, and commanded the blind to be brought to Him; it is now:—Be of good courage, rise; He calleth thee: Mark x. 49.

Ver. 32. **And Jesus stood still.**—At the cry, *Lord, Son of David;* which was, according to Luke, on His *festal departure* from Jericho at the head of the people. This also shows evidently that that great crisis of the Lord's life was come to which we have already made allusion. He suffers Himself now to be publicly appealed to as the Messiah, in the presence of all the people, which He had never done before: compare ch. ix. 27. The time for His acceptance of, and sympathy with, the Messianic hope of His people had now arrived.

cho. The road from Jericho to Jerusalem is exceedingly difficult and dangerous, ascending through narrow and rocky passes amid ravines and precipices, and infested by robbers, as in the time of the good Samaritan (Luke x. 30-34).—P. S.]

* [Similarly Wordsworth, who assumes that the blind man was not healed till the next day, and that Luke in his account anticipated the result by a prolepsis not uncommon in Scripture. He adds the remark that the frequent practice of *anticipation* and *recapitulation* agrees with the divine author of the Bible, to whom all time is present at once. Rabbi JARCHI, *in Gen. vi.*, applies to the Bible what is said of God: "*Non est prius, aut posterius, in Scriptura.*"—P. S.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. Joshua proceeded from Jericho to the conquest of the promised land—without, however, entirely effecting it. From Jericho, the city of palms, the Messianic procession set out; and it ended with His being delivered over to the Gentiles. But in a higher sense, the conquest of the promised inheritance with the sword of the Spirit was now decided.

2. The history of the blind man at Jericho symbolical of the endeavors of the great in God's kingdom to interpose between Christ's throne and the wretched.

[3. JOHN J. OWEN: "This miracle of healing the blind men has often been employed to illustrate the spiritual blindness of men, the earnestness with which they must apply to Christ (who, by His Spirit, is always passing by) for His healing mercies, and the readiness of the Saviour, on any such application made in penitence and faith, to put forth His healing power. Thousands have read this simple and touching story as a truthful history of their own spiritual blindness, and its removal through the abounding grace of Jesus Christ."—P. S.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The procession of the Lord from Jericho to Jerusalem the great turning-point in His life. 1. What it signified—the Lord's acceptance of His people's Messianic hopes; He suffered Himself to be publicly heralded as the Messiah. 2. How the Lord's friends regarded it—as a coronation procession, which no cry of misery should disturb. 3. How Christ Himself treated it—as a journey of redemption for believers.—The difference between a *legal procession*, and the journey of Christ led by the Spirit: the one would fanatically prevent disturbance by anything in the way; the other makes every seeming interruption augment its festal character, Acts ii. 13.—The difference between a worship which repels the wretched, and that which attracts them.—The coronation journey of Christ is glorified by every seeming interruption.—The Holy King and His unholy courtiers.—Christ, even through the multitude of noises, detects the individual cry of the petitioner.—What will ye that I should do unto you? Christ's kingly word to the mendicant blind.—He whose eyes are opened by Christ, lifts them first upon His regal procession.—They who receive their sight from Christ follow Him in the way.—The fellowship of misery: two blind men, ten lepers; and so throughout the evangelical narrative.—The Church is a fellowship both

of the needy and the saved.—The gift of the eye: 1. It is the revelation of the soul to the world; 2. the revelation of the world to the soul; 3. the symbol of the inner light of knowledge; 4. of the illumination from above.—The true procession of Christ a swelling stream of the grateful saved.—The wilderness of Jericho changed into a figure of Christ's work in the world: 1. Once a corner of robbers and murderers, now enlivened by the cry of salvation; 2. once the scene of Christ's temptation, now the scene of His glorification.—How and wherefore the Lord permitted the joyful acclamation of His people before His sufferings.—The self-renunciation in which the Lord, with the presentiment of His cross upon Him, surrenders Himself to the joy of His disciples: they did not understand the *whole* issue, which He clearly foresaw; they erred concerning the nearest issue; but in a higher sense they were right, inasmuch as the final issue could be no other than His glorious reign.

Starke:—They who are one in misery should unite their prayer.—The loss of physical sight is to man a great distress; but he is not so much troubled about his soul's blindness.—*Zeisius:* We must not be hindered in our prayers by the devil or the world, by flesh and blood.—*Cramer:* Turn not away your eyes and ears from the cry of the wretched.—Christ is much more willing to help than we to ask Him.—The following of Christ is the best gratitude.

Rieger:—He who easily yields his point to threats, is for the most part without the strong urgency of a true heart.—Happy he whom nothing restrains in his faith and believing cry.

FOURTH SECTION.

THE PROPHETIC HOSANNA OF THE PEOPLE AND THE SURPRISE OF THE CAPITAL.

CHAPTER XXI. 1–11.

(Mark xi. 1–10; Luke xix. 29–44; John xii. 12–19. Matt. xxi. 1–9 the Gospel for first *Advent*, and for *Palm-Sunday*.)

1 And when they drew nigh unto Jerusalem, and were come to Bethphage, unto the
2 mount of Olives, then sent Jesus two disciples, Saying unto them, Go into the village
over against you, and straightway ye shall [will] find an ass tied, and a colt with her:
3 loose *them*, and bring *them* unto me. And if any *man* say aught unto you, ye shall
say, The Lord hath need of them; and straightway he will send them [he sends them].[1]
4 All[2] this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, saying,
5 Tell ye the daughter of Sion, Behold, thy King cometh unto thee, meek, and sitting
[mounted, ἐπιβεβηκώς] upon an ass, and [yea upon][3] a colt the foal of an ass [of a beast
6, 7 of burden].[4] And the disciples went, and did as Jesus commanded them, And
brought the ass, and the colt, and put on them their clothes [garments], and they set
8 *him* [and he sat][5] thereon. And a very great multitude [most of the multitude][6]
spread their garments in the way; [and] others cut down branches from the trees, and
9 strewed *them* in the way. And the multitudes that went before [him],[7] and that follow-
ed, cried, saying, Hosanna[8] to the Son of David: Blessed *is* he that cometh in the name
10 of the Lord; Hosanna in the highest. And when he was come [had entered] into Je
11 rusalem, all the city [the whole city] was moved, saying, Who is this? And the mul-
titude [the multitudes][9] said, This is Jesus the prophet [the prophet Jesus][10] of [from]
Nazareth of Galilee.

[1] Ver. 3.—The *Recepta* reads the future: ἀποστελεῖ, which is sustained by B., D., the Vulgate, Itala, Lachmann, Tischendorf. But Griesbach and Scholz prefer the present: ἀποστέλλει, with Codd. C., E., G., K., al., which is more expressive, though apparently less suitable (Meyer).

[2] Ver. 4.—Lachmann and Tischendorf [in former editions, but not in that of 1859] omit ὅλον, *all*, according to Codd. C., D., L., Z., versions, and fathers. [Cod. Sinait. likewise omits it.—P. S.]

[3] Ver. 5.—Καὶ is epexegetical, and hence ἐπί before πῶλον is superfluous. [But Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford retain it according to B., L., Z., and Cod. Sinait. At all events καί does not express *addition* here, but *explanation* or *epexegesis* (*und zwar*, *and that*, or *yea*), and thus the apparent difference in the accounts of the Evangelists is easily solved. *See Exeg. Note* on ver. 2.—P. S.]

[4] Ver. 5.—Υἱὸν ὑποζυγίου. "The *ass* (ὄνος) is the animal meant by the word, but is also *characterised* by it." (Conant.) Lange: *Lastthier*. Comp. Isa. lxii. 11; Zach. ix. 9.—P. S.]

[5] Ver. 7.—The reading: ἐπεκάθισεν, *he sat*, instead of the *lect. rec.:* ἐπεκάθισαν, *they set*, is sustained by Codd. B., C., Origen, etc., and adopted in the critical editions.

[6] Ver. 8.—[Ὁ δὲ πλεῖστος ὄχλος. Lange and Ewald: *das meiste Volk;* Kendrick and Conant: (*the*) *most of the multitude*. Comp. ἄλλοι δὲ, *and others*, in the next clause.—P. S.]

[7] Ver. 9.—Προάγοντες αὐτόν [instead of προάγοντες simply]. So Lachmann, Tischendorf, [Alford], following B., C., D., al., [and Cod. Sinait.].

[8] Ver. 9.—[Ὡσαννά (originally a formula of supplication, but conventionally one of triumphant gratulation and joyful greeting to a deliverer, hence followed by the dative) was properly retained in the English, German, and other modern Versions, as Matthew retained it from the Hebrew (הוֹשִׁיעָה־נָּא, σῶσον δή, LXX., *Save now!*), comp. Mark xi. 9, 10; John xii. 18. So we have likewise from the Hebrew the words: *Jehovah, sabbath, manna, Zebaoth, amen*, etc.—P. S.]

[9] Ver. 11.—[Ὄχλοι as in ver. 9, where the E. V. correctly renders *multitudes*.—P. S.]

[10] Ver. 11.—[The oldest reading, sustained by Cod. Sinait., and adopted by Lachmann, Tregelles, Alford, and Conant, is ὁ προφήτης Ἰησοῦς, *the prophet Jesus*, instead of Ἰησοῦς ὁ προφήτης. But Dr. Lange in his version retains the received reading with Tischendorf, and takes no notice of the difference.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1. **Unto Jerusalem.**—Jerusalem is mentioned as the goal, to assign the motive for the mission of the two disciples. Jerusalem, יְרוּשָׁלַיִם, Ἱερουσαλήμ, Ἱεροσόλυμα:—according to Ewald, *possession* or *inheritance of peace;* according to Gesenius, the *people* or *house* of peace. At all events, *a seat of peace, the city of peace:** poetically, שָׁלֵם, Ps. lxxvi. 8; אֲרִיאֵל, Isa. xxix. 1, 8; and, earlier, יְבוּס Judges xix. 10; now called by the Mohammedans, *el-Khuds* ["*the holy*," or *Beit el-Makdis*, "*the holy house*," "*the sanctuary*"]. In every respect this city is the mysterious and wonderful flower of history:†—in its situation, in its history, in its religious position, and especially in its symbolical character. The city lay high; and the hills around came first into view, over which it spread gradually into the higher and lower city: the hill of Zion being the centre,—Zion, Moriah, Bezetha, Akra. Then the valleys, which made it a natural fortress: toward the west the valley of Gihon; toward the south-west and south, Ge-hinnom; toward the east, the valley of Kidron, bounded by the low hill of Gihon, the Mount of Evil Counsel, and the Mount of Olives with its three peaks. The city belonged to the inheritance of Benjamin, but was for the most part inhabited by the tribe of Judah.* As it respects the history of Jerusalem, we may distinguish the period before, and the period after, the exile. The former is subdivided into the time of the Canaanite origin of the place (Josephus calls its builder *Melchizedec*); the time of its gradual elevation and glory; the time of its humiliation down to the destruction of the first temple. The time after the exile may be divided into the Jewish, the Christian, and the Mohammedan periods. Wonderful have been the conquests and spoliations which Jerusalem has undergone, without being demolished.

[*See* the article *Jerusalem* in WINER'S *Realwörterbuch*, and in W. SMITH'S *Dictionary of the Bible* (vol. i. pp. 981-1035, by James Fergusson, very full and elaborate with maps); KRAFFT'S *Topographie Jerusalems* (Bonn, 1846); BARCLAY'S *City of the Great King;* and the well-known works on *Palestine*, by ROBINSON, VON RAUMER, VON SCHUBERT, TISCHENDORF, SCHULZ, STRAUSS, TOBLER, WOLFF, BAUSMAN, etc.]

To Bethphage.—It lay, according to ver. 2, straight before them, and was soon reached. בֵּית פַּגָּא, *house of figs*. The name indicates a favorable situation on the eastern side of the Mount of Olives. "Descending about 100 steps from the top of the Mount of Olives, the place is seen where Bethphage stood, though no ruin remains at this day to mark the spot: 15 stadia farther down, or a short half hour from Jerusalem (John xi. 18), we reach Bethany. The village (el Aziriyeh [from el Azir, *i. e.*, Lazarus]) is small and poor, occupied by Arabs (and Christians); the way to Jericho runs through it. The supposed houses of Martha, Mary Magdalene, Lazarus, Simon the leper, are shown to this day; but especially the sepulchre of Lazarus, hewn out of stone." Von Raumer. Winer suggests that Bethphage lay somewhat east of Bethany; and hence that it is named before Bethany in Mark xi. 1; Luke xix. 29. But in Mark xi. 1 the description runs backward from the starting-point: Jerusalem, Bethphage, Bethany; according to which, Bethphage lay between Jerusalem and Bethany. Robinson follows Winer in drawing the same wrong conclusion from the text.* Pococke thought that he found the ruins of Bethphage two English miles from the city; but Robinson assures us that there are no traces of it visible. The road, which passed from the valley of Bethany over the hill of Bethphage to the middle hill of the Mount of Olives, then passing downward to the valley of Kidron, was then lost in rich palm plantations and fruit and olive gardens. At the time of the Passover, the many trains of pilgrims, and the tents on the sides of the Mount of Olives (in which many pilgrims lodged), made the road look like a festal and excited encampment.

Then sent Jesus two disciples.—They are not further indicated. The sending was occasioned by the Messianic significance of the journey. The festive procession, which had come from Jericho to the neighborhood of the Mount of Olives, and halted there on account of the Sabbath, was increased on Monday morning by the adherents of Jesus who came out from Jerusalem to meet Him. On the evening before, many Jews had gone to Bethany, to see Jesus, and Lazarus, whom He had raised from the dead (John xii. 9). Others were now added to these. They received Him with palm branches, and went on, singing the Messianic greeting of Ps. cxviii. 26: Hosanna, blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord—the King of Israel. He would enter into the holy city with the emblems of the King of peace, according to Zech. ix. 9: hence the mission of the disciples.

Ver. 2. **Into the village.**—Bethphage.

An ass, and a colt with her.—"The seeming variation of the two animals from Mark xi. 2; Luke xix. 30; John xii. 14, is not to be derived (with de Wette and Strauss) from a misunderstanding of the prophetic passage, in which וְעַל עַיִר is the epexegetic parallel of עַל־חֲמוֹר. In the same way we must understand καὶ ἐπὶ πῶλον, ver. 5. Matthew also says that Jesus rode upon the *colt;* but the mother ani-

* [*Jedenfalls also ein* FRIEDENSHAIN, *ein* FRIEDENSSITZ, DIE FRIEDENSSTADT.]

† [*Die mysteriöse Wunderblume der Weltgeschichte*,—one of the many untranslatable poetic compounds of Dr. Lange. The Edinb. transl. has *mysterious glory*.—P. S.]

* [Gresswell and Nast remove the difficulty by supposing that Bethphage lay upon the direct line of this route, but that Bethany did not; so that one travelling from Jericho would come to Bethphage first, and would have to turn off from the road to go to Bethany.—P. S.]

mal was there, which circumstance the other Evangelists pass over." Meyer. The words of the prophet Zechariah run: "Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; shout, O daughter of Jerusalem: behold, thy King cometh unto thee: He is just, and having salvation; lowly, and riding upon an ass, yea, upon a colt the foal of an ass." Here there is a *parallelismus membrorum:* the ass in the former clause is more fully described in the second as the foal of the ass. Strauss thinks that the Evangelist misunderstood this parallelism, and accordingly made two animals out of one. But, doubtless, the Evangelist, who understood Hebrew poetry, thought of another explanation of the parallel: that, namely, between the mother ass and her foal, as it was realized in the actual event. The Evangelists, all of them, lay stress on the fact, already predicted by the prophet, that Jesus entered the city on a foal not yet ridden. This characteristic of the animal was symbolical, as the whole procession was symbolical. A new time; a new Prince; a new animal to ride upon. But if this foal had never borne a rider, it was necessary that the mother should be led by its side, in order to quiet it for such a service.—According to Justin Martyr (*Dial. c. Tryph.* 63), the foal was a figure of untamed heathenism; while the ass, accustomed to burdens, was a figure of Judaism under the law.* But the contrast of the old theocracy and the young ἐκκλησία seems more obvious. In the symbolism of the prophets the ass signifies the peaceable animal of the Prince of peace, in opposition to the proud war-horse of the conqueror. (Against the frivolous witticisms of Strauss on the two animals, compare Ebrard, p. 480.)

Loose them.—"Strauss has no ground whatever for making this prediction a myth, with allusion to Gen. xlix. 11." Meyer. The disciples were to loose the asses, which stood bound by the way, before the eyes of the standers-by; thus, believing in the word of Jesus, they were to perform an act which seemed violent, but was not so, inasmuch as the Lord knew beforehand the consent of these men, and communicated that assurance to the disciples.—But why did the Lord adopt such a method of entering Jerusalem? In this style of approach we see the character of His progress throughout the world. He is a King, at whose disposal all things stand when He wants them, but who has not anywhere, either for Himself or for His servants, great provision laid up beforehand. Thus He goes on His way through the world, as having nothing, and yet possessing all things. Doubtless, the fact of this provision may be traced to His friends at Bethany, as the provision of the guest-chamber at Jerusalem for the Passover was traceable to friends in the city; but in both cases the exact specification does not point to any external concert, but to the superhuman knowledge of Christ.

Ver. 4. **That it might be fulfilled.**—The words combine two passages: Isa. lxii. 11 ("Tell ye the daughter of Zion." Here the city of the present seems to be addressed as the daughter of the ideal, historical, Jerusalem), and Zech. ix. 9 (*see* above). This latter passage refers back indeed to the blessing of Judah, Gen. xlix. 11. Judah is there exhibited as combining the conqueror and the prince of peace (Shiloh): first, he is a conquering prince, and then the prince of peace; and in the latter capacity he makes use of the ass. Both these characteristics of Judah are typically separated in the contrast between David and Solomon; and in the Messiah they are united and fulfilled. Zechariah introduces the Messiah first as a warrior, ch. ix., and then makes Him enter Jerusalem as a Prince of peace. But the expression, "that it might be fulfilled," does not here, any more than in ch. ii. 23; John xix. 28, and elsewhere, signify a merely conventional and fortuitous realization of the prophecy. The occasion and need of the moment was the obvious motive. But to the Spirit of God these historical occasions were arranged coincidences with the prophetical word. Christ was in need of the foal of the ass, inasmuch as He could not make His entrance on foot in the midst of a festal procession. He must not be lost in the crowd; it was necessary that He should take a prominent position, and appear pre-eminent. But if He became conspicuous, it must be in the most humble and peaceable fashion: hence the choice of the ass. The dignity of the procession required the ass's colt, and this made the history all the more symbolical. But it could not be concealed from the spirit of Christ that here again the plain historical necessity coincided with the symbolically significant fulfilment of a prophetical word. The disciples did not perceive this significance till afterward.

Ver. 5. **And (Yea) a colt.**—The καί is epexegetical, for closer description:—*and that* the foal of an ass.

Ver. 7. **He sat upon them,** ἐκάθισεν ἐπάνω αὐτῶν.—This is referred to the *garments* by Theophylact, Euth. Zygab., Castal., Beza, Meyer, and others [Wordsworth]. As referred to the *animals*, it is variously explained. De Wette: a want of accuracy in Matthew. Strauss says that the Evangelist makes Jesus slavishly and unreasonably carry out the prophetic description, by riding at once upon both animals.* Fritzsche, Fleck, and older commentators, suppose that He rode on both alternately. Other expositors, as Winer, Olshausen, Ebrard, Lange, comp. Calvin and Grotius, [also Alford and Nast], explain it as merely an inexact expression, as we might say: "He sprang from the horses." We do not, however, lay stress upon this comprehensive expression, but upon the idea that He controlled the pair by riding the foal. (Olshausen is mistaken in supposing that He rode the ass.) If we ascribe to the Evangelist a symbolical consciousness, this circumstance assumes a living significance. The old theocracy runs idly and instinctively by the side of the young Church, which has become the true bearer of the kingdom of Christ. With all the enmity that existed, she could not separate from it. The rider of a team does really ride both the united animals, though in a mechanical sense only one; and this view is not opposed, as Meyer thinks, by the fact that in ver. 5, where riding in a narrower sense is spoken of, such latitude of expression cannot be assumed. Glassius's explanation of an *enallage numeri* must then fall to the ground.

* [Chrysostom, Jerome, and other fathers, likewise regard the ass as a figure of the synagogue burdened with the yoke of the law, and the colt as a symbol of the Gentiles who were untamed and unclean before Christ sat upon them and sanctified them. *See* more of this patristic allegorizing in the *Catena Aurea* of THOMAS AQUINAS, Oxford ed. I. ii. p. 708 sqq. Of modern commentators Wordsworth adopts it in this as in many other cases.—P. S.]

* [In his new *Life of Jesus*, 1864, p. 524, Strauss is not ashamed to repeat this specimen of frivolous criticism, to which it is sufficient to reply that Matthew knew as much Hebrew and had as much common sense as any modern critic of his Gospel.—P. S.]

Ver. 8. **Spread their garments** [loose overcoats, comp. ch. v. 40].—Oriental mark of honor at the reception of kings, on their entrance into cities: 2 Kings ix. 13. The disciples had made their upper garments into coverings for the animals; the people follow the example, and spread theirs as a carpet on the way.

Ver. 9. **Hosanna to the Son of David.**—הוֹשִׁיעָה נָּא (יְהוָֹה), *Help* (*Lord*); *give Thy salvation!* Ps. cxviii. 25. The expression seems gradually to have become a Messianic prediction of good wish (*Hail, io triumphe, ἰὴ παιάν*). Hence its meaning varied according to circumstances; but here its highest significance was disclosed. "The dative is not governed by the verb in ὡσαννά, but is a dative of relation, and Hosanna is a festal cry of good will." Meyer.—**Hosanna in the highest.**—In the highest regions (ὑψίστοις), that is, in heaven. De Wette: May Hosanna be confirmed by God in heaven. Beza: May it be given by God in heaven. Fritzsche: May it be cried by angels in heaven. Meyer: May it come down from heaven upon the Messiah. Salvation in the heavens, viewed generally, means as well the heavenly salvation which God gives and ensures, as the salvation uttered and announced from the heavens. Hence we might more precisely explain it —May our Hosanna be in the heavens! that is, as a prayer, and as a prayer granted (comp. Luke ii. 14), as an exclamation sent to heaven, and as an echo from heaven. In short: May our Hosanna resound in heaven!—These Messianic acclamations seem, according to ver. 9, to have taken the form of an antiphonal song between the multitudes which went before the Lord (the disciples from Jerusalem and the Mount of Olives), and those which followed Him (the Galilean pilgrim-train).

Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord.—The pilgrims' greeting on their entrance into Jerusalem at the time of the feasts (greeting and response, Ps. cxviii. 26).

[Jesus, instead of giving way to this joyous enthusiasm of the shouting multitude, weeps tears of sympathy and compassion over unbelieving Jerusalem. *See* Luke xix. 41. Could such a trait have been invented?—P. S.]

Ver. 10. **And when He was come into Jerusalem.**—The journey over the Mount of Olives, and the Lord's emotions at sight of the city, are passed over. *See* Luke.

The whole city was moved, ἐσείσθη.—The verb denotes a violent excitement—the being mightily moved, in the external and figurative sense. Meyer: "The excitement was contagious." But what follows shows that the excitement must not be regarded as merely sympathetic. The question uttered shows this of itself. Jerusalem knew the person of Jesus sufficiently to have spared the question, had it wished.

Ver. 11. **The prophet from Nazareth of Galilee.**—Meyer: "The *well-known* prophet. The *accompanying* crowds had most distinctly termed Him the Messiah; but the less enthusiastic multitude in the city required first of all to know His name, condition, and so forth. Hence the full answer, in which the ὁ ἀπὸ Ναζαρ. τ. Γαλιλ. is certainly not without Galilean pride." This may be so. Yet it must not be overlooked, that the question of surprise with which the proud city met the Galilean pilgrim-train seems to have lowered in some degree the spirit of their testimony. It is not "the Messiah," but, somewhat ambiguously, "the prophet," that they reply.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *See* the preceding explanations.

2. On the jubilant acclamation which the disciples, on the Mount of Olives, and in prospect of the city, poured out in honor of Jesus, compare Luke xix. 37; John xii. 17. Doubtless we have here—where they celebrated the miracles of Christ, and especially His raising of Lazarus—the first preludes of the speaking with new tongues on the day of Pentecost. The common object of both, in the first as well as in the last, is τὰ μεγαλεῖα τοῦ Θεοῦ.

3. According to the Wolfenbüttel Fragmentist, the entrance of the Lord was the last attempt at a Messianic political foundation of a kingdom. But this is quite contrary to the whole of our Lord's previous conduct, as He always avoided, not only all political suggestions and temptations, but even the very idea of a political Messiah itself.* The readiness with which He could yield to the true Messiah-idea, implanted in the minds of His disciples, proves that among them also the proper hope of a political Messiah had been already overcome. That the Lord never made a single attempt to set in motion a political project, does not say enough: we find that His disciples never did so. But that the Lord should suffer Himself to be introduced festally as their Messiah by His people, was only consistent with the truth of His Messiahship and the theocratically-justified expectations of His people. The entry was the purified historical fulfilment of the Messianic expectations of Israel, in conformity with the promise; but, in the form it assumed, it was a testing accommodation to the Messianic expectation of the age. In the wilderness, the popular spirit had tested Him; now His appearance tested the popular spirit. This test was a judgment upon the unbelief of the people; but it was also an important purifier of the rising faith of those who truly believed in Him. To Himself, finally, the kingly procession was a prelude of His sufferings; but it was also a symbol to Him of His glorification, of His kingly procession through the world, and of His future great epiphany. Hence the history of Palm Sunday is read as an Advent lesson. Palm Sunday stands at the beginning of Passion-week, as an anticipation of Easter; just as, conversely, the day of Crucifixion is gently reflected in the Ascension day,—this also being the Lord's departure,

* [Comp. the remarks of Dr. W. Nast *in loc.*: "The absurd assertion of the antichristian critique, 'that Jesus' entry was His last attempt to found a worldly Messianic kingdom,' is sufficiently refuted not only by the uniform tenor of His previous conduct, rejecting sternly all insinuations and offers of that kind as coming from the Evil One, but also by the form of the entry, which was well adapted to remove every idea of earthly power and worldly glory, even amid the hosannas of His followers and the attending crowds, and to set forth the spiritual nature of His kingdom. His followers did not carry swords or spears, but branches of palm-trees, and He Himself did not ride the war-steed of a king, but the colt of an ass, the symbol of peace. That the entry had no political character appears also from the fact that the Roman Government took no notice of it."—Even Strauss, in his new *Life of Jesus*, p. 278, refutes the hypothesis of Reimarus (the author of the *Wolfenbüttel Fragments*), and well remarks that he who makes his entry unarmed with unarmed followers on a peaceful animal must either be already acknowledged as ruler, or he must aim at dominion in such a manner as excludes all force and political power.—P. S.]

and the consecration of His church as a church of the cross.

[4. HEUBNER: Christ's entry into Jerusalem forms in every particular a memorable contrast to the subsequent passion. In the one case He stands on the Mount of Olives, the spot of His glory, looking over Jerusalem, which did homage to Him; in the other He was led to Golgotha, the place of the skull, surrounded by the graves and skulls of malefactors. Here He held His solemn entry, attended by friends and followers and the shouting multitude; there He is thrust out of the city, surrounded by enemies, tied as a criminal, and led by officers and executioners. Here His disciples serve Him willingly, and feel themselves honored thereby; there they forsake Him in dismay and despair. Here all vie with each other in honoring and beautifying His entry; there they spit in His face, and heap all kinds of ignominy on Him. Here they spread garments in the way; there He is stripped of His garments, which are parted by casting lots, while He hangs naked on the cross. Here branches are strewed in the way, and He walks on beds of flowers; there He is scourged and crowned with thorns. Here He rides into the city as King; there He is compelled to bear His own cross. Here the prophecy of Zechariah concerning the coming King is fulfilled; there the awful prophecy of Isaiah concerning Him that is despised and rejected of men. Here He is saluted King, amid shouts of hosannas; there He is rejected, condemned, and crucified as a false prophet and blasphemer. In whose life is there such a contrast—such a sudden transition from joy and glory to humiliation and ignominy? And amid the high excitement of these rapidly-changing scenes, Christ maintains a perfect equanimity, neither giving way for a moment to the importunities of His excited friends, nor overwhelmed by the apparent hopelessness of His cause.—P. S.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Jesus comes as the Christ publicly to His city; or, the day of decision. It was, 1. prepared for with sacred foresight; 2. longed for with the most fervent desire; 3. adorned with the richest miracles of salvation; 4. like a festal revelation from heaven; 5. and yet it was a day of severest test and of decisive judgment for Israel; but, finally, 6. also a day of the approach of redemption for the people of God.—Jesus and Jerusalem; or, the King of peace and the city of peace: 1. Designed ever for each other; 2. bringing each other the doom of death; 3. for each other the means of glorification.—The Mount of Olives: 1. He came over the Mount of Olives,—the Christ of the Spirit; 2. He went to heaven from the Mount of Olives,—the Mediator of the Spirit.—The festal entrance of Christ into the holy city, in its significance for all times: 1. The present—as the glory of the life of Jesus; 2. the past—as the glory of the ancient covenant; 3. the future—as the type of the coming of Christ in glory.—The concealed friends of Christ in the history of His kingdom.—The obedience of the two disciples, a severe test of faith.—The palm-entry of Christ a heavenly type of the coming kingdom of heaven itself.—The festal procession of the Prince of peace: 1. Scriptural representations: the blessing of Jacob, Solomon's rule, the word of Zechariah. 2. Under what signs He appears: the animal of peace, the palm of peace, the people of peace (the last intensely excited, yet without any trace of insurrection). 3. What peace He brings: peace of the heart with God, peace of fellowship with brethren, peace of reconciliation with the existing order of things. In all *His* peace.—The lesson taught by the great palm-entry without any trace of insurrection: 1. Regard not (hierarchically) Christ as separated from His people (freedom of faith); 2. regard not (despotically) the people as separated from their Christ (freedom of conscience).—How we should receive the Lord at His entrance: 1. With devotion of heart, in trust and obedience; 2. with the praise of lips; 3. with festive offerings of our substance.—Lift up your heads, O ye gates! Ps. xxiv.—The Hosanna of the festal multitudes; or, Israel in the beauty of spring: 1. The blossom full of promise; 2. the fading flowers; 3. the fruit that remained.—The Hosanna, as echo of the angels' song, Luke ii., in the hearts of men.—The Hosanna in its twofold issue: Crucify Him, and the tongues at Pentecost.—Jerusalem once more excited by the announcement of the Messiah (compare Matt. ii.).—All the world must ask who He is.—Loud praise and timid confession.—The day of salvation: To-day, to-day, if ye will hear His voice, Heb. iii. 7.—Palm Sunday, a preparatory festival, 1. of Good Friday; 2. of Easter; 3. of the Ascension; 4. of Pentecost.

Starke:—With what alacrity does the Lord make arrangements for His end! — A King whose best throne is in the heart.—As all things spoken concerning Christ in the Scripture were fulfilled, so also must be fulfilled all things spoken in the Scripture concerning His church.—Christ's kingdom is not of this world, but spiritual.—The works of God are not with observation.

Gerlach:—After Jesus had so often avoided the snares of His enemies, He now goes directly to meet the death long predicted for Him; while His friends expected the manifestation of His kingly dignity, and His enemies expected His total destruction.—The hopes of friends and foes were alike fulfilled, yet not in the way they respectively thought: He suffered death, that He might gloriously conquer in it; He received His kingdom on the cross.

Heubner:—Jesus orders all things with supreme wisdom and prudence for His final work.—The last journey of Jesus to Jerusalem. — Jesus is always seeking access into our hearts.—The kingdom of God a kingdom of gentleness and love.—The entry of Christ: 1. Blameless and harmless; 2. wise and dignified; 3. in accordance with duty and necessity.—The contrast between this entrance and the Passion history.—The glorification of Jesus at His last entrance into Jerusalem: 1. By what He Himself did; and 2. by what took place on Him through the instrumentality of others.—What excitement in all the world and in all times concerning Jesus!—On the first Sunday in Advent this Gospel must be viewed in itself, on Palm Sunday in its connection with the history of the Passion.

The Text as the Gospel for Advent.—*Hossbach*:—Christ holding His entry anew among us.—*Hey*:—Pious enthusiasm, in its value and in its insufficiency.—*Schultz*:—When can the Christian say of himself that salvation is come nigh to him?—*Lisco*:—The preparation for the coming of Christ.

The Text as the Gospel for Palm Sunday.—*Reinhard*:—Jesus' deportment before and during the swift process of His last sorrows.—*Harms*:—In all our sad journeys, let us take Jesus for our guide.—*Bachmann*:—Introduction to the proper celebration of the holy week.—*Ahlfeld*:—A glance into the na-

ture of the kingdom of Christ.—*Dittmar* :—Behold, thy King cometh unto thee.—*Rautenberg* :—Dare we utter our Hosannas to the Son of David, who is going to Calvary?

FIFTH SECTION.

THE CLEANSING OF THE TEMPLE, AND CHRIST'S ABODE IN IT AS ITS KING.

Chapter XXI. 12–22.

A. *The House of Prayer and Mercy, in contrast with the Den of Thieves.* Ch. XXI. 12–14.

(Mark xi. 11–17; Luke xix. 45, 46.)

12 And Jesus went into the temple of God, and cast out all them that sold and bought
in the temple, and overthrew [overturned, κατέστρεψε] the tables of the money chang-
13 ers, and the seats of them that sold [of sellers of] doves,[1] And [he][2] said unto them, It
is written, My house shall be called the [a] house of prayer (Is. lvi. 7); but ye have
14 made [make][3] it a den of thieves [robbers, λῃστῶν, Jer. vii. 11].[4] And the blind and
the lame[5] came to him in the temple; and he healed them.

[1] Ver. 12.—[Τῶν πωλούντων τὰς περιστεράς, Lange and other German Versions: *Taubenhändler; Luther: Taubenkrämer; sellers of doves.* Doves were offered to the Lord by the poor as a substitute for a lamb, Lev. v. 7; xii. 8; Luke ii. 24.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 13.—[A new sentence ought to commence with ver. 13, and hence the *He* inserted. So also Lange.—P. S.]

[3] Ver. 13.—Lachmann, Tischendorf, [Tregelles, Alford], read: ποιεῖτε, *ye make*, with Codd. B., L., [Cod. Sinait.], and other ancient authorities, instead of ἐποιήσατε of the *Recepta* (from Luke).

[4] Ver. 13.—[Comp. the Authorized Version in Jer. vii. 11, from which this passage is quoted. Λῃστής, *robber, plunderer*, is stronger than κλέπτης, *thief.* The Authorized Version, however, generally renders it *thief* (in 11 passages of the N. T.), except in John x. 1, 8; xviii. 40; 2 Cor. xi. 26. The difference appears plainly in John x. 8: κλέπται εἰσὶν καὶ λῃσταί, *thieves and robbers.* But Luther's *Mördergrube*, which Lange retains, is too strong; although the verse quoted from Jeremiah stands in connection with the charge of murder and the shedding of innocent blood. Better: *Räuberhöhle, spelunca latronum.*—P. S.]

[5] Ver. 14.—Cod. C. reverses the order: χωλοὶ καὶ τυφλοί. [In the English Version the definite article is required, or else the addition of the word *persons.*—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 12. **And He went into the temple of God, and cast out.**—Mark's account is here the more exact. On the evening of Palm Sunday Jesus went into the temple, and looked round,—without, however, doing anything then. He thereupon returned with the disciples to Bethany, which may be regarded as the Lord's resting-place during the festival. Returning next day to the temple, the fig-tree was cursed. Then followed the cleansing of the temple.

The temple.—הֵיכַל יְהוָֹה, הֵיכַל קֹדֶשׁ, בֵּית אֱלֹהִים. Here comes into view the history of the temple—its construction, and form, and meaning. The Jewish temple was the mysterious centre of Israel: hence its history is the history of the people down to the destruction of Jerusalem. We may distinguish, 1. The period of the patriarchal altar; 2. that of the tabernacle (travelling, moveable, and at last resting on Zion); 3. the temple of Solomon; 4. the temple of Zerubbabel; 5. the temple of Herod. At the destruction of Jerusalem the temple disappeared, its meaning being absorbed in the Church of Christ; that is, the type gave place, or was lost in the antitype. The temple-vision of Ezekiel has only an ideal, symbolical meaning. The attempt of Julian to rebuild the temple only served to demonstrate the continuance of its doom; and the temple of the Egyptian Jews at Leontopolis was only a transitory imitation. As the temple, in the narrower sense, had three historical periods, so the sanctuary of the temple had three divisions—the Forecourt, the Sanctuary, and the Holiest or Holy of Holies. *See* Winer, art. *Tempel* [also the valuable article *Temple*, illustrated with plates, in W. Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. iii., pp. 1450–1464]. As to the signification of the temple, compare the various treatises of Bähr, Kurtz, Sartorius, Hengstenberg, and others, upon the *Mosaic Cultus*, but especially Friederich: *Symbolik der Mosaischen Stiftshütte*, Leipz., 1841, and Bähr: *Der Salomonische Tempel*, Karlsruhe, 1848. The following are some of the views taken: 1. The temple was a figure of the universe (Philo, Josephus); 2. a symbol of the dwelling-place of God after the analogy of human dwellings (Hoffmann); 3. a figure of the human form and nature (intimated by Philo, Luther, Friederich); 4. a symbol of heaven (Bähr); 5. the symbol of the kingdom of God under the Old Covenant (Hengstenberg, Tholuck, Lisco, etc.).—So far as the temple of God was a symbol, it was a figure of the theocracy—of the

kingdom of heaven which comes down to earth; but so far as it was a type—that is, a figure of something to come *—it was a figure of the body of Christ (according to John ii.), and of His Church as the real house of God. And thus, as the Holiest of all was the most essential thing in the type, it will find its final and consummate realization in the kingdom of glory (comp. Heb. ix. 24; Rev. xxi. 22).

And cast out.—The locality of this scene was *the Court of the Gentiles.* The history of this court is obscure, but it is a very important element in the history of the temple; it is connected with the development of the hierarchy on the one hand, and with the advancement of proselytism on the other. The changes which this court underwent, reflected precisely the course of these relations. The tabernacle had only one forecourt, the court of the altar of burnt-offering (Exod. xxvii. 1–8). The only hint of a distinction between the place of the people and the place of the priests, is the circumstance that the laver of brass for the priests' washing (Exod. xxxviii. 8) stood nearer the sanctuary than the altar of burnt-offering. In the temple of Solomon the court of the priests (the inner court) was distinguished from the great court (2 Chron. iv. 9). Probably, also, it was a few steps higher; and the altar of burnt-offering belonged to the court of the priests. In the temple of Zerubbabel, Alexander Jannæus (B. C. 106) separated the court of the priests by a wooden trellis from the external court of the temple (Joseph. *Antiq.* xiii. 3, 5). This wooden trellis gave way in the temple of Herod to one of stone, of the height of an ell (Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* vi. 6, 5); and in this temple also the court of the Gentiles assumed a definite character. The temple itself was surrounded by terraces, which formed the several courts in gradation. "The outermost space (in the Talmud: *mountain of the house;* 1 Mac. xiii. 53: *mountain of the sanctuary*) went round the whole temple, and had several gates. It was laid with colored stones, and begirt with beautiful halls. A few steps higher a stone lattice, three ells high, ran all the way round, with here and there Greek and Latin inscriptions, that forbade all who were not Jews to proceed any farther toward the sanctuary (on pain of death, *Bell. Jud.* vi. 2, 4). Hence the space of the temple mountain as far as this limit has been called by *Christian archæologists* the Court of the Gentiles." (*See* Winer, *sub Tempel*, ii. p. 581.) Through this court was reached the court proper, which in its *breadth* was divided into the courts of the men and the women (the former lower than the latter), but in its *depth* was divided into the court of the people and that of the priests. The "Court of the Gentiles" grew in importance in proportion as the distinction between proselytes of the gate and of righteousness came to prevail,† and it became customary for even devout Gentiles to bring gifts to the temple.

* [A circumlocution of the German: *Werdebild*, for which I know of no precise equivalent in English.—P. S.]

† [The Edinb. transl. here, as often, reverses the sense of the original, and reads: *as the distinction* . . . . *was done away* (in German: *hervortrat*). The rabbinical distinction between גֵּרֵי הַשַּׁעַר and גֵּרֵי הַצֶּדֶק or גֵּרֵי הַבְּרִית far from being done away with, appeared just in the later history of Judaism, and was in full force at the time of the apostles. In the N. T. the proselytes of the gate are called *οἱ σεβόμενοι* (or *φοβούμενοι τὸν Θεόν*), Acts x. 2; xiii. 50; xvi. 14; xvii. 4, 17; xviii. 7 (comp. Joseph. *Antiq.* xiv. 7, 2); they were more susceptible for the gospel than the Jews and Gentiles, and generally formed the nucleus of the Gentile-Christian congregations.—P. S.]

Those that sold and bought.—"In the court of the Gentiles was the so-called temple-market, *tabernæ*, where sacrificial animals, incense, oil, wine, and other things necessary for the service and sacrifice, were to be obtained." Lightfoot.—**The tables of the money-changers.**—They changed, at a certain premium, the common money, which was accounted profane, for the double drachmas which served for the temple-tribute. Thus the agents who had to collect the temple-tribute from the various districts resorted generally to these money-changers. According to Lundius, these collectors themselves took charge of the exchange in the temple. It is highly probable that many of those who came up from the country paid at this time the tribute which fell due in the month of Adar. "And possibly other business connected with money-changing by degrees had crept in." Meyer.

The Cleansing of the Temple.—According to Pearce, Wetstein, Lücke, and others, this act was identical with the cleansing mentioned in John ii. 13, which belonged to the first visit of Jesus to the Passover after His entrance on His ministry; according to Chrysostom and most modern commentators, the account of the Synoptists is a repetition of that earlier one. It is obvious that they omitted the earlier action of the same kind, because they record, generally, only the last of Christ's visits to the feast.* But for John's point of view, the former cleansing was a decisive crisis, and was recorded by him as such. There is no difficulty in assuming, as the distinct narratives require, that the act was performed twice. And although it might be possible that the two records mutually influenced each other (as Neander, *Leben Jesu*, 388, assumes), it is plain that the later has its own advance in meaning. According to Mark, Jesus did not suffer that any man should carry vessels through the temple (ch. xi. 16); and, while in John we read, "Make not My Father's house *a house of merchandize*," in the last accounts we read of the house of prayer for all nations being turned into *a den of robbers.* As to the Lord's warrant for attacking the existing irregularities, which had become regular by practice, various explanations have been given. Selden (*de Jure nat. et gent.* iv. 6) and others found upon the act of Phinehas (Num. xxv. 11) the supposition of an Israelite zealot-right; that is, the right of at once and violently assaulting and abolishing any crying offence in the theocracy. Lücke (*Com. on John*, ii. 15, 16) thinks that zealotism as a right can not be proven, yet he gathers from the history of the people and the writings of the Rabbins that the reforming vocation in the Jewish church, if it really existed, stood higher than the external right. Of course, it is not necessary to assume that this right was invested with legal sanctions. The real question is, whether there ever was an acknowledgment of a right to interfere, under divine impulse or as a prophet, with existing abuses. And of that there can be no doubt; indeed, the sad prelude of this zealotism was the violence of the brothers Simeon and Levi (Gen. xxxiv. 25), and the last perversion of it was the conduct of the Zealots during the siege

* [So also Alford. The omission of the first cleansing in the Synoptists is in remarkable consistency with the fact that their narrative is exclusively Galilæan until this last journey to Jerusalem. It is impossible that either the Synoptists or John should have made such a gross error in chronology, as the hypothesis of the identity of the two narratives assumes.—P. S.]

of the city. Between these extremes, however, there are many illustrious instances of zealotism; and, in its pure fundamental idea, it continues permanently in the discipline of the Christian church.* That, at His first cleansing of the temple, Jesus acted from the impulse of prophetic zeal, and according to zealot-right, is plain from the consideration that He had not yet publicly announced Himself under the name of the Messiah; and the Evangelist significantly refers to the saying, "The zeal of Thine house hath eaten me up" (John ii. 17). We may, therefore, thus distinguish: On the first occasion Christ attacked the abuses of the temple in the authority of prophetic zealotism; on the second occasion, in the authority of the Messiah. But we must not overlook the fact, that the former authority forms the true Old Testament basis for the latter; and that the Messiah, as a reformer, was the consummation and glorification of the prophetic zealotism. Much has been said about the assent of the people. Origen and Jerome regarded this as a specific miracle. Doubtless, the fact is explained by the miraculous influence of the prophetic majesty of Christ on the one hand, and of the evil conscience of the Jews on the other.

[The silent submission of these buyers and venders, who by their physical force might easily have overpowered Jesus, conclusively proves the sublime moral majesty and power with which our Saviour performed this act, and silences the objection of some modern skeptics, who see in it an outbreak of violent passion, which is always a sign of weakness. It was a judicial act of a religious reformer, vindicating in just and holy zeal the honor of the Lord of the temple, and revealed the presence of a superhuman authority and dignity, which filled even these profane traffickers with awe, and made them yield without a murmur. Jerome regards this expulsion of a multitude by one humble individual as the most wonderful of the miracles, and supposes that a flame and starry ray darted from the eyes of the Saviour, and that the majesty of the Godhead was radiant in His countenance.—P. S.]

Ver. 13. **And He said unto them.**—Isa. lvi. 7: "For My house shall be called the house of prayer for all nations." Jer. vii. 11: "Is then this house, which is called by My name, become a den of robbers in your eyes?" The two passages are quoted freely, and joined together according to their Old Testament meaning.—In what sense a den of robbers? 1. Theophylact: τὸ γὰρ φιλοκερδὲς λῃστρικὸν πάθος ἐστίν. 2. Fritzsche: Ye gather together here money and animals, as robbers collect their booty in their den. 3. Rauschenbusch (*Leben Jesu*, 309): By these abominations the Gentiles, for whose prayer this house was designed, are kept back from God's service. Assuredly, the fact that the place of prayer for the Gentiles was made a market for beasts, was a robbery inflicted on the rights of the Gentiles. *Humanity* was outraged by the *false churchliness* or bigotry of the Jewish *odium generis humani*.

Ver. 14. **And blind and lame persons came to Him.**—And then He turned the desecrated temple again from a den of robbers into a house of mercy.

* [I took the liberty of substituting this idea for the "*Polizei des christlichen Staates*" in the original, which implies the union of church and state, and is hardly applicable to our country.—P. S.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The prophet Malachi predicted the coming of the Messiah with these words: "The Lord, whom ye seek, will suddenly come to His temple, even the messenger of the covenant whom ye desire, saith the Lord of hosts" (Mal. iii. 1). These words had their manifold fulfilment in the whole course of Christ's first advent; and will again be fulfilled at His second glorious coming. Once, however, they were fulfilled in their most literal sense: then, namely, when Jesus, amidst the greetings of His people, made His festal entry into the temple. But in the cleansing of the temple Christ exhibited Himself as the eternal Purifier and Reformer of the theocracy, of the human heart, and of the whole Church.

2. Only one full day did Jesus dwell and rule personally in the temple—the Monday of the Passion-week. This theocratical residence of one day had, however, an eternal significance. It re-established for ever the spiritual destination of the temple, and spiritually confounded and silenced in the temple itself all the false ministers and watchmen of the temple. Thus was the word of Haggai fulfilled, not only in its spirit, but also in its letter: "The last glory of this house shall be greater than the first" (ch. ii. 9). But, if we include the entrance on the Sunday evening (the looking round, the visitation), and the solemn departure from the temple on Tuesday (its abandonment to judgment), then the one day must be extended to three.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Jesus and the temple in Jerusalem. 1. How related in the Spirit of God: The temple the type of His body and of His Church; Christ the realization and the glory of the temple. 2. Separated through the guilt of the world: Christ crucified through false temple-service; the temple desolated through the death of Christ, and abandoned to the fire. 3. Still inseparable in the spiritual sense: all pious worship is in a Zion which the Lord will glorify. Christ visits His temple in all the world.—The predictions of the prophets have all been fulfilled on the temple (Haggai, Malachi).—The sanctification of the temple perfected by Christ: 1. Its purifying (negative sanctification); 2. its consecration (positive—by the healing of the blind and lame).—The Lord cleanses His temple: 1. the Church; 2. the hearts of His people.—The twofold change passed upon the temple: Its change from a house of prayer for all nations into a den of robbers—under the semblance of higher holiness; the change of the desecrated den of robbers into a house of prayer and of mercy.—That kind of worship which outrages charity to man, may transform the house of prayer into a den of robbers.—Christian consecration of the church: 1. It separates the church from the market-place; 2. it unites prayer and mercy (the hospital and the prayer-hall, *hôtel-dieu*).—The great day of Christ's abode in the temple: 1. Its being a strange occurrence was a sign how soon the temple might be a spiritual desert; 2. but it was also a proof that the Lord will manifest Himself to His people in His temple.—The three temples on Mount Zion, and the three consecrations (1 Kings viii.; Ezra vi.; and this section).—The zeal of the holy Son for the

honor of His Father's house.—The temple itself became at last the witness of the miracles of Jesus.

Starke:—Hedinger: Foul blasphemers require severe dealing: the fear of man, flattery, and gentleness, will not drive them out.—*Cramer:* As everything has its time, so everything has also its place. —All reform must proceed according to the rules of Holy Writ: thus Christ is the Founder of all scriptural reformation.—*Canstein:* Churches are exclusively for divine worship.—He who would spiritually walk and see, must come to Christ in the temple.

Lisco:—The cleansing of the temple had a symbolical reference to the cleansing of the Church of God.

Heubner:—The Lord's sacred anger at the desecration of God's house.—This cleansing reminds us, 1. of the holiness which the temple had in Christ's eyes; 2. of the guilt of all who desecrate God's house and day; and 3. of our duty to do all we can to maintain their sanctity.—Lavater says, that His being *able* to do this was the proof that He *ought* to do it.

[*Matthew Henry:*—Abuses must first be purged out and plucked up before that which is right can be established.—Buyers and sellers driven out before (John ii. 14, 15), will return to the temple and nestle there again, if there be no continual care and oversight, and if the blow be not often repeated.—That which is lawful and laudable (as buying and selling and changing money) in another place and on another day, defiles the sanctuary and profanes the sabbath.—This cleansing of the temple was the only act of regal authority and coercive power of Christ in the days of His humiliation; He began with it (John ii.), and He ended with it.—In the reformation of the Church we must go back to the authority of the Scripture as the supreme rule and pattern, and not go further than we can justify by a final: *It is written* (ver. 13).—*The blind and the lame* were debarred from David's palace (2 Sam. v. 8), but were admitted into God's house, from which only the wicked and profane are excluded.—The temple was profaned and abused when it was turned into a market-place, but it was graced and honored when it was made a hospital.—Christ's healing was the real answer to the question: *Who is this?* and His healing in the temple was the fulfilling of the promise, that *the glory of the latter house should be greater than the glory of the former.*—*W. Nast:*—By cleansing the temple Jesus symbolically sets forth the purity of heart which He requires of His church in general and of each individual believer. 1 Cor. iii. 16, 17; 2 Cor. vi. 16.—P. S.]

B. *The Children in the Temple: the High Priests and Scribes.* CH. XXI. 15–17.

15 And [But, δέ] when the chief priests and scribes saw the wonderful things[1] that he
did, and the children crying in the temple, and saying, Hosanna to the Son of David;
16 they were sore displeased, And said unto him, Hearest thou what these say? And
Jesus saith unto them, Yea; have ye never read, Out of the mouth of babes and suck-
17 lings thou hast perfected [prepared, κατηρτίσω][2] praise (Ps. viii. 2)? And he left
them, and went out of the city into Bethany; and he lodged there.

[1] Ver. 15.—[*Wonderful things* is better for τὰ θαυμάσια, *mirabilia* (Vulg.), than *wonders*, which Conant substitutes here for the Authorized Version. *See* the *Exeg. Notes* on ver. 15.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 16.—[Καταρτίζειν is variously translated in the English Version: *to mend* (Matt. iv. 21), *to restore* (Gal. vi. 1), *to perfect* (1 Cor. ii. 10; 2 Cor. xiii. 18; Heb. xiii. 21), *to fit* (Rom. ix. 22), *to frame* (Heb. xi. 3), *to prepare* (Heb. x. 5). In Ps. viii. 2, whence the above passage is quoted, the English Version reads: "Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings hast thou *ordained* (or founded, established, Sept.: κατηρτίσω for the Hebrew יִסַּד) strength (עֹז) because of thine enemies." The proper translation here is: *hast prepared*, as in Heb. x. 5: σῶμα δὲ κατηρτίσω μοι, *a body hast thou prepared for me*, as a sacrifice to thee. The translation: *perfected*, is from the Latin Vulgate: *perfecisti*. But Tyndale and Cranmer have: *ordained* (as in Ps. viii. 2); Fritzsche: *parasti tibi laudem;* Luther: *du hast zugerichtet;* de Wette, van Ess, Lange: *du hast Lob bereitet;* Ewald: *ich will Preis aufrichten.* As to the difference between *strength* in the Hebrew (עֹז) and *praise* in the Sept. and here (αἶνος), the latter is to be regarded as an explanation of the former. עֹז means both (Ex. xv. 2; Ps. xxix. 1; Is. xii. 2, etc.), and as it is here ordained out of the *mouth*, it must mean strength of *speech* or *praise*. The strength of the weak is praise, and the praise of God and Christ gives strength and power.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 15. **The wonderful things,** τὰ θαυμάσια.—More comprehensive than *wonders* or *miracles*. The expression occurs in the New Testament only here, but in the Sept. and the Classics it is common. The moral miracle, in a wider sense, which exhibited the Lord as King in His temple, is combined with the miracles proper.

And the children.—According to Sepp (*Leben Jesu*, iii. 192), by these children we must understand the virgins and youths consecrated to the temple-service. There can be no doubt that there were such youths dedicated to the temple; but, as they were under the immediate authority of the priests, their jubilant cries would at once have been suppressed by these priests themselves.

Ver. 16. **Hearest thou what these say?**—By this question they indirectly declared that they did not attribute to Him the Messianic dignity which this Messianic Hosanna involved. At the same time, they pronounced their judgment that children were not authorized to express any religious sentiment or opinion. It was contempt of the little ones. They laid the stress on the *doctrinal utterance* of the little ones; Christ, on the other hand, on their *religious singing*.

Have ye never read?—Ps. viii. 2 [ver. 3 in the Hebrew and German text]. The passage of the Psalm finds the praise of God (in the original: *a might;* Sept.: *praise*) in the mouth of theocratical children, and even in the lispings of sucklings. Not that the Israelite sucklings might be three or four years old, and certainly not because of "the tender sounds of lisping sucklings." The thought is, that the Great God of heaven is glorified by the seemingly insignificant men of this lower earth, including the very lowest of them, down to the very root of life. In the children and sucklings of the theocratic Church His praise begins to grow: it begins with the very life of human nature accepted by grace. The antitheses to be noted here, are the *mouth* of the *infants*, as also the *sucklings* and *praising*. But Christ gives this passage prominence, because in it the Old Testament expressly approved and praised just that which here took place. In the application of this Scripture, we find without doubt the following points:—1. The praise of the Messiah is the praise of God. 2. The praise of children is a praise which God Himself has prepared for Himself, the miraculous energy of His Spirit. 3. The scribes might fill up the rest: Thou hast prepared praise—"*on account of Thine adversaries, to bring to silence the enemy and the accuser.*" Not only are the passages themselves, which Christ quotes from the Old Testament, of the highest importance, but also the connection of those passages. The eighth Psalm is to be reckoned among the typical Messianic Psalms; it describes man in his higher Christological relations.

Ver. 17. **And He left them.**—How often does this indicate the moment of His moral discomfiture of His enemies, and of His free withdrawal from the contest! He passed the night in Bethany, which was His stronghold. On *Bethany, see* above, ch. xxi. 1.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. Christ rules in the midst of His enemies, Ps. cx.

2. God oft prepares for Himself a praise from the lips of infants and new-born babes, in opposition to the adult and aged who dishonor His name; and from the lips of a younger generation, who have not yet reached office and dignity, in opposition to a decaying generation of fathers who deny their official calling to give the Lord His praise.

3. The same children, whom they would denounce as wicked disturbers, Christ regards as a chorus of unconscious prophets of His own advent.

4. Not only the blind and the lame, the afflicted and the children, but the Greeks also who desired to see Jesus, illustrated this great day. John xii. 20–36 belongs to the same history, but probably to the day following.

[5. HEUBNER: May God in mercy protect us from such theologians and priests as are offended by children and their harmless songs! Children, too, are to sing the praises of God and of Christ. Would that our children were trained from early infancy for such praise.—P. S.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The obduracy of the priests and scribes in the presence of the Lord's miracles in the temple.—The question of the Pharisees; or, the evening clouds.—Not for one day did the hypocrites permit the Lord to rule undisturbed in His temple.—The jubilant children and the murmuring scribes: Earnest pastime and trifling earnestness in the temple; the free play of children a divine prophecy, and the constrained temple-service a godless play.*—The echo of the palm-entry in the hearts and lips of the children.—The Son of David, the beautiful dream of the youth in Israel.—The children's Hosanna: 1. A significant act of childlike piety; 2. a noble blossom of the hope of Israel; 3. a divine testimony to the glory of Christ; 4. a sad echo of the elders' dying Hosanna.—The mouth of babes and sucklings, in its vocation to condemn presumptuous tutorship in the Church.—*Hearest Thou what these say?* To unbelief, in the garb of bigotry, the most touching testimonies of faith are but blasphemies.—Those who are always reading, but do no more than read, must always hear the Lord's question: *Have ye never read?*—They who *read* wrongly, objected to the Lord that He *heard* wrongly.—Christ and the Scriptures for ever bear witness to each other, against false scribes and false Christians.—Jesus leaves the contemners of His name to themselves, and goes His way. 1. He leaves them refuted and confounded; 2. He goes to His friends, to His rest and His work, with His own.—One day of the Lord is as a thousand years (Ps. xc. 4; 2 Pet. iii. 8).—Christ in the temple the Restorer of all original rights in one right: 1. Of all rights (those of the Gentiles, of the poor, of the children); 2. in one right (that of God and His Anointed).

Starke:—Quesnel: The envy, covetousness, and ambition of corrupt clergy do more harm in the Church than its open enemies can do.—The world cannot bear that God and Christ should be honored.—*Zeisius:* The world mocks all pious simplicity.—Hardened and envious persecutors we must leave, and escape from danger.

Heubner:—Quench not the Spirit, especially among children.—Only childlike hearts can praise Him aright.—*Melanchthon* (at the conference at Torgau): We need not be anxious; I have seen those who fight for us (praying mothers and children).

[*Nast:*—The children in the temple, proclaiming the honors of Christ, as emblems of the apostles and disciples, whom Christ calls "babes" in contrast to the wise and prudent of the world. "I thank thee, Father," etc., Matt. xi. 25.—P. S.]

* [In German: *Das freie Kinderspiel eine göttliche Prophetie, der unfreie Tempeldienst ein ungöttliches Schauspiel geworden.*—P. S.]

C. *The Deceptive Fig-tree, rich in Leaves, but without Fruit on the Temple-mount. The Symbolical Cursing.* CH. XXI. 18–22.

(Mark xi. 12–14, 20–26.)

18, 19 Now in the morning, as he returned into the city, he hungered. And when he
saw a fig tree in the way [seeing one (solitary) fig tree by the road side],[1] he came to
it, and found nothing thereon, but leaves only, and [. And he] said unto it, Let no
fruit[2] grow on thee henceforward for ever. And presently [forthwith] the fig tree
20 withered away. And when the disciples saw *it*, they marvelled, saying, How soon is
21 the fig tree withered away![3] [And] Jesus answered and said unto them, Verily I say
unto you, If ye have faith, and doubt not [do not doubt], ye shall not only do this *which
is done* to the fig tree [not only shall ye do this with the fig tree],[4] but also if ye shall
say unto this mountain [of the temple], Be thou removed [taken up, Ἄρθητι], and be thou
22 cast [and cast, καὶ βλήθητι] into the sea; it shall be done. And all things, whatsoever
ye shall ask in prayer, believing, ye shall receive.

[1] Ver. 18.—[Ἰδὼν συκῆν μίαν ἐπὶ τῆς ὁδοῦ, Lange, emphasizing μίαν: *Er sahe* EINEN (*einzelnen, single*) *Feigenbaum über dem Wege*. Bengel: One in that place (*unam illo loco*). So also Meyer and Winer (*ein vereinzelt dastehender Feigenbaum*). Possibly it may have a symbolical reference to the singular position of the Jews as the one tree of God's planting, standing conspicuous and alone both in favor and in guilt. Others, however, explain the μίαν in this case from the later usage of the Hebrew אֶחָד and the Aram. חַד.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 19.—B., L. read: οὐ μηκέτι. The *Recepta* omits οὐ as superfluous.

[3] Ver. 20.—[Lange likewise takes the sentence as an *exclamation*, πῶς = *quam*. But the Lat. Vulgate (*Quomodo continuo aruit?*), Luther, van Ess, Meyer, Ewald, Winer, Conant take it as a *question*, and render πῶς παραχρῆμα ἐξηράνθη ἡ συκῆ: *How did the fig-tree forthwith wither away?* So also the editions of Stier and Theile, Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Alford in their punctuation. The former view agrees better with the parallel passage in Mark xi. 21, and is not inconsistent with the use of ἀποκριθεὶς which follows in both accounts. But we may regard it perhaps best as an *interrogative exclamation*. In any case the *is* of the E. V. ought to be stricken out and *withered away* substituted for *is withered away;* for ἐξηράνθη, as here used, expresses the act past and gone, while ἐξήρανται in Mark xi. 21 signifies the result.—P. S.]

[4] Ver. 21.—[Οὐ μόνον τὸ τῆς συκῆς ποιήσετε, lit.: *this of the fig-tree*, or: *this with the fig-tree*, as Luther, Ewald, and Lange have it (*das mit dem Feigenbaum thun*).—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 18. **He hungered.**—Mark gives us here the stricter note of time. On the day of the procession Jesus only looked round the temple observingly; He then went out to Bethany, for it was evening. On Monday morning, as He went back to the temple, He was hungry; and this gave occasion for the cursing of the fig-tree. A day later, on Tuesday morning (not the evening before), the disciples, again accompanying the Lord to the city, found the fig-tree *dried up from the roots*. Matthew combines the two separate points of this transaction in one, in order to make more prominent the meaning of the whole. He would bring before the reader's mind the antitype of the barren fig-tree, the high priests and scribes in their unbelieving conduct.* The Lord's hunger on this morning shows us with what ardor He went to take up His abode in the temple: He had not taken time to eat His breakfast at Bethany.†

Ver. 19. **One fig-tree** (μίαν).—Bengel: *Unam illo loco*. The fig-tree, תְּאֵנָה, *ficus carica*, was, like the vine, one of the most extensive and best cared-for productions of Palestine: this appears in the saying, "Under his own vine and fig-tree,"—a figure of peace (1 Kings iv. 25). Compare on it the *Bibl. Encyclops.*, especially Winer's, and also Robinson and von Schubert on the Holy Land. The Rabbins studied under the shadow of the fig-tree, as in an arbor. It was often planted by the waysides, because the dust of the road was an absorbing counteraction to the strong flow of the sap,—so hindering a too great development of leaves, and promoting its fruitfulness. The fig itself was a common and much esteemed article of food. Three kinds were distinguished: 1. The early fig, *Bicura*, *Boccore*, which ripened after a mild winter at the end of June, and in Jerusalem still earlier. 2. The summer fig, *Kermus*, which ripened in August. 3. The winter fig, or later *Kermus*, which came to maturity only after the leaves were gone, and would hang through a mild winter into the spring: it was larger than the summer fig, and of a dark violet color. This last kind cannot here be meant, since a winter fig-tree might well have been long ago robbed of its fruit; and for the spring fig this might seem a too early period of the year. But its extraordinary show of leaves so early, gave a promise of early figs; since in the fig-tree the blossom and the fruit appear before the formation of the leaves.* Thus it was this profusion of leaves which warranted the Lord in expecting to find figs on the tree. But the fruit was wanting. Mark explains: οὐ γὰρ ἦν καιρὸς σύκων.† This does

* [Similarly TRENCH, *On the Miracles*, p. 435, who calls those who exaggerate such small chronological differences, "the true Pharisees of history, straining at [out] gnats and swallowing camels."—P. S.]

† [Bengel observes on ἐπείνασε, *esurivit:* "*rex ille gloriæ, v. 5. Miranda exinanitio.*"—P. S.]

* [PLINY, *Hist. Nat.* xvi. 49: *Ei demum serius folium nascitur quam pomum.*]

† [On this passage of Mark there are different interpretations. *See Com. in loc.* and a long note in TRENCH (p. 441 sq.). Trench considers it very doubtful whether at that season of the year, March or April, either fruits or leaves ordinarily appear on the fig-tree; but this tree, by putting forth leaves, made pretension to be something more than others, to have fruit on it, which in the fig-tree appears be-

not mean, however, that at such a time of year figs were not to be expected; but that *the tree had not yet been stripped*, if it had ever borne fruit. The symbolical element, however, is the main thing here. A fig-tree laden with leaves promised fruit: if all fruit was wanting, it was a deceiver; and therefore an apt image of the hypocritical Jewish priesthood.

By the road-side: ἐπὶ τῆς ὁδοῦ.—"The tree stood *over the way*, either on an elevation in the way, or the way was a declining one." Meyer. But a third supposition may be made, that the tree extended its branches over the level path.

Let no fruit grow on thee henceforth for ever.—The same criticism which objected against the treatment of the Gergesenes, that it was an invasion of private property, objects against the cursing of the fig-tree, that it was an outrage upon the forest laws. But as the driving out of the demons was no wild hunt, so the word of cursing was no felling axe. It cannot be said that a miracle of punishment was alien to Christ's spirit. But this was not properly a miracle of punishment: it was a symbolical sign of the punishment which the people had to expect from God, but which our Lord exhibited as a sign of His own retribution, as being already the glorified King. And in this warning act—which was to seal to the disciples the subsequent judicial prophecies, and especially to release their hearts from all faith in the seeming sanctity of the temple-worship—lay the great design of the whole transaction. Jesus made a symbolical use of the attractive appearance of the leaves, and executed a symbolical judgment of the deceptive tree, which deluded and mocked the hungry traveller, in order to teach His disciples that they also must at last cease to seek spiritual nourishment from the leaf-covered, but fruitless priesthood, and look forward to the Divine judgments which would cause the withering away of the theocratic people.*

And forthwith (παραχρῆμα) **the fig-tree withered away.**—The tree was diseased through the overflow of its false life, which exhausted itself in luxuriant foliage. But the word of curse was miraculous, and the first prelude of that great miraculous work of Christ which at His advent will blast all the evil of this present world. But primarily it was an earnest of the speedy withering of the land, when the palms should vanish, the fig-trees wither, the fountains be sealed up, and Canaan become a waste. Paulus explained it as an announcement of the speedy natural death of the tree in popular language; Strauss, as a mythical construction of the parable in Luke xiii. 6; Origen, Chrysostom, and the moderns generally, as a prophetic symbolical representation of the doom upon the spiritual unfruitfulness of Israel. [The absence of any instruction on this symbolical meaning of the destruction of the fig-tree, is no valid objection against it; for this meaning readily suggested itself in view of the time and place of the act, and the whole series of denunciatory discourses which follow, are an eloquent commentary, as Meyer correctly remarks, on the silent symbolical eloquence of the withered fig-tree.—P. S.]

Ver. 21. **If ye say to this mountain.**—The mountain to which the Lord pointed, was doubtless the hill of the temple itself. It was, like the fig-tree, a figure of the hypocritical character of the Jewish worship, as it lay in the way of the spread of the gospel, a future hindrance to His disciples in their work. This mountain, the theocratic Judaism, must be cast into the sea of the nations (destruction of Jerusalem), before the Church of Christ could reach its consummation and free development. Certainly this was not to be effected by judicial punishments on the part of the disciples themselves; but it was for them to exhibit symbolically the judgment of God, which would issue in such a translation of the temple mountain, by turning away from the Jews, and carrying the gospel, the true Zion, to the sea of the Gentile world. The displacement of the temple mountain had therefore two points, which, however, here coalesce.

Ver. 22. [**And all things, whatsoever ye shall ask in prayer,** etc.—This promise is confined, of course, to prayers of faith (vers. 21 and 22), which implies agreement with the will of God, and excludes the abuse of this promise.—In John, Christ defines believing and effective prayer to be prayer in His name, John xiv. 13; xv. 16; xvi. 24.—P. S.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

[1. The cursing of the fig-tree is both a *Parable* and a *Prophecy* in action, performed on the public road near the city and the temple, on Monday of the Passion-week, exhibiting Christ as the final Judge of that people which soon afterward crucified Him.—P. S.]

2. Jesus did not so much curse the fig-tree, as make manifest the curse of its internal blight. It was, as it respects a fig-tree, only dead wood, fit only for the fire. To this destination He now gave it up. That Jesus had in view the spiritual condition of His people as figured by this tree, is plain from the parable, Luke xiii. 6. Yet Israel was, in God's purpose, the early fig-tree among the nations, Hos. ix. 10.

3. The withered fig-tree was a sign of many judgments: (1) A sign of the withering congregation of the temple or the expiring of the theocracy; (2) of withering Canaan; (3) of withering external church organizations and sects; (4) of the withering old earth. The sudden blight was a token of the instantaneousness of the judgment—of the catastrophes which had been in secret long prepared for.

[4. The Saviour performed innumerable miracles of mercy on living and feeling men, but only one miracle of judgment, and that not on a human being, which He came to save, but on an unfruitful, unfeeling tree, and with a view to benefit all impenitent sinners by timely warning them of their danger. Thus we have even here a proof of Christ's goodness in His severity. Thus even the barren fig-tree bears constant fruit in the garden of Holy Scripture as a symbol of the fearful doom of hypocritical

fore the leaves. This tree vaunted itself to be in advance of all the other trees, and challenged the passer-by that he should come and refresh himself with its fruit. Yet when the Lord drew near, He found it like others, without fruit, for, as Mark says, the time of figs had not yet arrived. The fault lay in the hypocritical pretension, the chief sin of Israel.—P. S.]

* [Trench calls attention to the fact that the only times that the fig-tree appears prominently in the New Testament it appears as a symbol of evil; here and at Luke xiii. 6. According to an old tradition, it was the tree of temptation in Paradise. It is noticeable, also, that Adam attempted to cover his nakedness and shame with fig-leaves and to assume a false appearance before the Lord. But the Saviour, of course, in destroying the fig-tree because of its unfruitfulness, did not attribute to it any moral responsibility and guilt, but simply a fitness as a symbol of moral unfruitfulness worthy of punishment.—P. S.]

ostentation and unfruitfulness. (Comp. similar remarks of Hilary, Grotius, Heubner, Trench, and Wordsworth.)—P. S.]

[5. The tree was not cursed so much for being barren, as for being false. No fruit could be expected of any nation before Christ; *for the time of figs was not yet.* The true fruit of any people before the Incarnation would have been to own that they had no fruit, that without Christ they could do nothing. The Gentiles owned this; but the Jews boasted of their law, temple, worship, ceremonies, prerogatives, and good works, thus resembling the fig-tree with pretentious, deceitful leaves without fruit. Their condemnation was, not that they were sick, but that, being sick, they counted themselves whole. (Condensed from Trench and Witsius.)—P. S.]

[6. Striking simultaneous exhibition of Christ's humanity in hungering, and of His divinity in the destruction of the fig-tree by a word of Almighty power which can create and can destroy. BENGEL: *Maxima humanitatis et deitatis indicia uno tempore edere solitus est.* John xi. 35, 40. WORDSWORTH: "He hungers as a Man, and withers the tree as God. Whenever He gives signs of human infirmity, some proof of His divine power is always near." Comp. the poverty of His birth, and the song of angels and the adoration of the shepherds and magi; the circumcision, and the name of Christ; the purification in the temple, and the hymn of Simeon and Hanna; His obedience to His parents, and astonishing wisdom in the temple; the baptism on Jordan, and the voice from heaven and the Holy Spirit descending on Him; the announcement of His passion, and the transfiguration on the mount; the payment of tribute-money to the temple, and the miracle of the fish with the stater; the cross, and the royal inscription, etc.—P. S.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

How Jesus, with holy self-forgetfulness, early hastened to the scene of His great day's work.—He spiritualized everything natural: even His own hunger and thirst were made awakening sermons.—Christ everywhere, in the best sense of the phrase, made a virtue out of necessity.—The barren fig-tree on the mountain of the temple a perpetual exhortation to the Church: 1. A faithful image of the priestly community in Israel as it then appeared (full of leaves, empty of fruit); 2. a warning example in its sudden blight under the curse (revealed as a dead tree, and as such given up to the fire).—The withering fig-tree as a warning to self-examination also for individual believers.—A sound fig-tree must put forth blossom earlier than leaves.—The interpretation of His act by His word: 1. The fig-tree has a close reference to the temple mountain; 2. as the fig-tree stopped Jesus in His way, so the temple mountain stopped the disciples; 3. as the Lord removed the hindrance by His miraculous word, so the disciples must overcome it by a miraculous faith, which should remove the hill of Zion into the midst of the nations (although, in doing so, the Jews were dispersed among the peoples).—All that the Christian asks in faith is given to him: 1. In faith it is given to him what he should ask; 2. in faith he asks what shall be given to him.

Starke:—The world often lets Christ's servants suffer hunger and need.—When we are in want, we suffer what Jesus suffered.—Faith lays low all imaginations that exalt themselves against the knowledge of God, 2 Cor. x. 4, 5.—Teachers remove mountains when they overcome in faith, and remove out of the way, the hindrances which are thrown in the way of their vocation.—Faith and prayer: Faith is the source of prayer; prayer the voice of faith.

Lisco:—Jesus in His human necessity, ver. 18; and in His divine power and dignity, ver. 19.

Heubner:—Warnings in nature: Life killed by frost; blossom cankered by worms; fruit poisoned from within.—There was one even among the twelve disciples to whom this curse applied; and every one who is unfaithful to Christ has such a judgment of hardening, abandonment of God, to expect.—Jesus, after miracles of love, performs yet one miracle, which should demonstrate His power to punish and to ruin, as it belongs to the Judge of all flesh; He did not, however, perform this on man, whom He was not come to destroy, but on an inanimate object.—Faith is here, and everywhere, the firm assurance of the heart concerning that which God wills.

Rieger:—We are reminded of the weeping over Jerusalem, Luke xix.; of the parable of the two sons, Matt. xxi. 28–31; of Rom. xi. 20: "Be not high-minded, but fear."

SIXTH SECTION.

THE ASSAULTS OF THE EXTERNAL THEOCRACY UPON THE ROYAL LORD IN HIS TEMPLE.

CHAPTER XXI. 23–XXII. 46.

The symbolical transaction of the fig-tree begins to unfold itself in spiritual judgments upon the Jews in all their authorities. The second day of the stay of the Messiah in the temple is come, the Tuesday of Passion-week; or the third, if we include the day of the entry. It was the great day of contest after the day of peace: a day on which Jesus endured victoriously the hostile attacks of the authorities in the temple, in which He silences and puts to confusion their several bands, one after another; and

then, after His great judicial discourse (ch. xxiii.), in view of their obduracy and in prospect of their violence, voluntarily leaves the temple. The first assault was made by the high priests and elders: it is disguised under the forms of *official authority*. Jesus confronts them, and discloses their true position by three parables, ch. xxi. 23-xxii. 14.—The second attack was an attack of cunning, led on by Pharisees and Herodians: they ironically assume that He has Messianic authority, in order that they may politically entangle Him (vers. 15-22). Then follow the Sadducees with their attack. They seek, by their alternative, to involve Him in Sadducean or antinomian assertions (vers. 23-33). Hereupon, the Pharisees make their last desperate assault, with a tempting and fundamentally threatening question of the law; and are reduced to pronounce their own discomfiture by His counter-question touching the divine dignity of the Messiah, according to Ps. cx.—(Then follows the judicial discourse of ch. xxiii.; and finally the departure from the temple.)

A. *The Attack of the High Priests and Elders, and the Victory of the Lord.* CH. XXI. 23-27.

(Mark xi. 27-xii. 12; Luke xx. 1-19; xxii. 1-14.—*The Gospel for the 20th Sunday after Trinity.*)

23 And when he was come into the temple, the chief [high] priests and the elders of
the people came unto him as he was teaching, and said, By what authority doest thou
24. these things? and who gave thee this authority? And Jesus answered and said unto
them, I also will ask you one thing [one word, λόγον ἕνα], which if ye tell me, I in like
25 wise will tell you by what authority I do these things. The baptism of John, whence
was it? from heaven, or of men? And they reasoned with [among][1] themselves, saying,
If we shall say, From heaven; he will say unto us, Why [then, οὖν] did ye not
26 then believe him? But if we shall say, Of men; we fear the people [multitude, ὄχλον];
27 for all hold John as a prophet. And they answered Jesus, and said, We cannot tell
[We do not know, οὐκ οἴδαμεν]. And he said unto them, Neither tell I you by what
authority I do these things.

***Transition to the Offensive.*—First Parable: The Parable of the Two Sons (the hypocritical unbelief). VERS. 28-32.**

28 But what think ye? A *certain* man had two sons; and he came to the first, and
29 said, Son, go work to day in my [the][2] vineyard. He answered and said, I will not;
30 but afterward he repented, and went. And he came to the second [other],[3] and said
31 likewise. And he answered and said, I *go* [I will, ἐγώ],[4] sir; and went not. Whether
of them twain [Which of the two, Τίς ἐκ τῶν δύο] did the will of *his* father [the father's
will, τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρός]? They say unto him, The first.[5] Jesus saith unto them,
Verily I say unto you, That the publicans and the harlots go into the kingdom of God
32 before you. For John came unto you in the way of righteousness, and ye believed
him not; but the publicans and the harlots believed him: and ye, when ye had seen *it*,
repented not[6] afterward, that ye might believe him.

Second Parable: The Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen (the murder of Christ, and the judgment). VERS. 33-46.

33 Hear another parable: There was a certain[7] householder, which [who] planted a
vineyard, and hedged it round about [put a hedge around it, φραγμὸν αὐτῷ περιέθηκε],
and digged [dug] a winepress in it, and built a [watch-] tower, and let it out to hus-
34 bandmen, and went into a far [another] country:[8] And when the time of the fruit [the
fruit-season][9] drew near, he sent his servants to the husbandmen, that they might re-
35 ceive the fruits of it [to receive his fruits].[10] And the husbandmen took his servants,
and beat one, and killed another, and stoned another [and one they beat, and another
36 they killed, and another they stoned].[11] Again, he sent other servants more than the
37 first: and they did unto them likewise. But last of all he sent unto them his son, say-
38 ing, They will reverence my son. But when the husbandmen saw the son, they said
among themselves, This is the heir; come, let us kill him, and let us seize on [have][12]

39 his inheritance. And they caught [took, λαβόντες] him, and cast *him* out of the vine-
yard, and slew *him*.[13]
40 When the lord therefore [When therefore the lord, ὅταν οὖν] of the vineyard com-
41 eth, what will he do unto those husbandmen? They say unto him, He will miserably
destroy those wicked [miserable] men [or: he will wretchedly destroy those wretches],[14]
and will let out *his* [the] vineyard unto other husbandmen, which shall [who will] ren-
42 der him the fruits in their seasons. Jesus saith unto them, Did ye never read in the
Scriptures, The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the
corner: this is the Lord's doing [from the Lord, παρὰ κυρίου], and it is marvellous [won-
43 derful] in our eyes (Ps. cxviii. 22)? Therefore say I unto you, The kingdom of God
44 shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof. And
whosoever shall fall on this stone shall [will] be broken: but on whomsoever it shall
fall, it will grind him to powder.[15]
45 And when the chief priests and Pharisees had heard his parables, they perceived
46 that he spake of them. But when they sought to lay hands on him, they feared[16] the
multitude [multitudes, τοὺς ὄχλους], because they took him for a prophet [held him as a
prophet, ὡς προφήτην αὐτὸν εἶχον].[17]

Third Parable: The Marriage of the King's Son (the judgment of the rejection of Israel and the new theocracy of the kingdom of heaven). Ch. XXII. 1–14.

1 And Jesus answered and spake unto them again by [in, ἐν] parables, and said,
2 The kingdom of heaven is like unto a certain king, which [who] made a marriage for
3 his son, And [he] sent forth his servants to call them that were bidden to the wedding:
4 and they would not come. Again, he sent forth other servants, saying, Tell them
which [that] are bidden, Behold, I have prepared my dinner [τὸ ἄριστον, early meal,
midday-meal]: my oxen and *my* [the] fatlings *are* killed, an all things *are* ready: come
5 unto the marriage. But they made light of *it*, and went their ways [went away, ἀπῆλθον],
6 one to his farm, another to his merchandise: And the remnant [But the rest, οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ]
took [laid hold of, κρατήσαντες] his servants, and entreated *them* spitefully [ill-treated,
7 ὕβρισαν], and slew *them*. But when the king heard *thereof*, he was wroth: and he sent
8 forth his armies, and destroyed those murderers, and burned up their city. Then saith
he to his servants, The wedding is ready, but they which [that] were bidden were not
9 worthy. Go ye therefore into the highways [thoroughfares, διεξόδους τῶν ὁδῶν],[18] and
10 as many as ye shall find, bid to the marriage. So those servants went out into the
highways [ὁδούς], and gathered together all as many as they found, both bad and good:
11 and the wedding was furnished with guests. And when the king came in to see the
12 guests, he saw there a man which [who] had not on a wedding garment: And he saith
unto him, Friend, how camest thou in hither not having a wedding garment? And he
13 was speechless [put to silence, ἐφιμώθη]. Then said the king to the servants, Bind
him hand and foot, and take him away, and[19] cast *him* into outer darkness; there shall
14 be weeping and gnashing of teeth. For many are called, but few *are* chosen.

[1] Ver. 25.—Παρ' ἑαυτοῖς. Lachmann and Tischendorf [not in the ed. of 1859] read: ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, after B., L., Z., etc. The latter reading is preferable, since the sanhedrists had to consult among themselves before giving a general answer.

[2] Ver. 28.—Μου is omitted in many MSS. [So also in Cod. Sinait. and in the critical editions of Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Alford.—P. S.]

[3] Ver. 30.—[Τῷ ἑτέρῳ is the correct reading, sustained by the best authorities, including Cod. Sinait., instead of the *Recepta*: δευτέρῳ, which after πρώτῳ appears as a gloss. Dr. Lange, however, retains δευτέρῳ with Lachmann (who follows the Vatican Cod.), and makes no mention of the other reading.—P. S.]

[4] Ver. 30.—[Ἐγὼ, κύριε, is, of course, elliptical, to which ὑπάγω, or πορεύομαι, or ἀπέρχομαι must be supplied. The various readings: ναί, κύριε, ὑπάγω, κύριε, and others, are to be traced to the desire of amending an apparently incomplete phrase.—P. S.]

[5] Ver. 31.—*Lect. rec.*: ὁ πρῶτος. [So also Tischendorf and Alford.] Lachmann [and Tregelles] after B., D.: ὁ ὕστερος; still others: ἔσχατος, *novissimus*. This reading is connected with the reversion of the answers in vers. 29 and 30, but the sense remains the same. Comp. for different views Meyer. [Comp. also the note of Conant in favor of ὕστερος, *i. e.*, *the later*, *the tardier one*, he who was behind the other in his compliance; which is descriptive, while πρῶτος merely identifies. The reversion of the order in some authorities may be easily accounted for by the error of a transcriber who thought that the parable must refer to the successive calling of Jews and Gentiles (as Origen, Chrysostom, and Jerome do), while it applies to two classes in the same nation.—P. S.]

[6] Ver. 32.—Cod. B., al., Lachmann, [and Alford]: οὐδέ [for οὐ which is retained by Tischendorf in the edition of 1859.—P. S.]

[7] Ver. 33.—[Lit.: "*There was a man, a householder,*" ἄνθρωπος ἦν οἰκοδεσπότης, Lange: *Es war ein Mensch, ein Gutsherr.* All the critical editions omit τις (*certain*) after ἄνθρωπος.—P. S.]

[8] Ver. 33.—[Ἀπεδήμησεν means: *he went abroad* (Lange: *er zog über Land*), without reference to distance, as is implied in the *far* of the E. V.—P. S.]

[9] Ver. 34.—[Ὁ καιρὸς τῶν καρπῶν, as distinct from χρόνος.—P. S.]

[10] Ver. 34.—[Λαβεῖν τοὺς καρποὺς αὐτοῦ: αὐτοῦ, like the previous one after δούλους, referring to the householder as the subject of the sentence, and not to the vineyard, as in the E. V. *See* Meyer and Conant *in loc.*—P. S.]

[11] Ver. 37.—[So Luther, Lange, and Conant, according to the emphatic form of the original: ὃν μὲν ἔδειραν, κ.τ.λ.—P. S.]

[12] Ver. 38.—[The critical authorities, including Cod. Sinait., and editions read: σχῶμεν for κατάσχωμεν, which seems to be a gloss.—P. S.]

[13] Ver. 39.—Cod. D., al., in reverse order: *they slew him and cast him out of the vineyard.* A correction in keeping with a passionate proceeding. The order of the *Recepta* is better. The expulsion from the vineyard before the murder signifies the priestly excommunication and rejection which preceded the crucifixion.

[14] Ver. 41.—[Κακοὺς κακῶς (=*pessimos pessime*) ἀπολέσει, a classic phrase of the purest Greek (*petita ex purissimo sermone Græco*, as Grotius observes). The paronomasia brings out the agreement of the deed and the punishment. In German: *er wird die Elenden elendiglich umbringen* (Meyer); *schlimm wird er die Schlimmen umbringen* (Lange); *übel wird er die Ueblen* (better: *Uebelthäter*) *vernichten* (Ewald). In English we have no equivalent phrase. The rendering of the Authorized Version is as good as any I have seen. Dr. Conant retains it. Dr. Geo. Campbell (*The Four Gospels*, etc.) renders: *he will put those wretches to a wretched death*, which I have slightly altered in the text. The Rheims Version has: *the naughty men he will bring to naught*, after the Vulgate: *Malos male perdet.*—P. S.]

[15] Ver. 44.—Omitted by Tischendorf without sufficient authority. [Meyer defends the words, and accounts for the omission by an oversight of a transcriber who passed from αὐτῆς καί, at the close of ver. 43, at once to αὐτὸν καί, at the close of ver. 44. Lachmann retains the verse, but in brackets.—P. S.]

[16] Ver. 46.—[Better: *And they sought . . . . but they feared*, καὶ ζητοῦντες . . . . ἐφοβήθησαν, as in ch. xiv. 5, where the E. V. renders: *And when he would have put him to death, he feared the multitude.*]

[17] Ver. 46.—[As in ver. 26, or: *they counted him as a prophet*, as the E. V. renders the same phrase in ch. xiv. 5.—P. S.]

[18] Ch. xxii. ver. 9.—[Διέξοδος, *transitus* and *exitus* (*Durchgang* and *Ausgang*, Passow), a *way through* and *out*, a *crossing, fork* of the roads, where many resort or pass; here a common outlet of the ways (τῶν ὁδῶν) that lead into it, a *thoroughfare*. Lange translates it: *Scheidewege*, and ὁδούς, *Strassen.*—P. S.]

[19] Ver. 13.—[The words: ἄρατε αὐτὸν καί, *take him away and*, are omitted by Lachmann, Tregelles, Alford, and Lange in his Version (who, however, translates καί), but retained by Tischendorf in the edition of 1859. *See* Tischendorf and Alford, *Crit. apparatus.*—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ch. XXI. 23. **As He was teaching.**—At first the members of the Sanhedrin, with the high priest himself at their head, confronted the Lord with an official and formal inquiry. Their action was passionately prepared; for, no sooner had Jesus repaired again to the temple, than they were on the spot. Their inquiry was hostile in its design; His opponents would oppress Him at once by their authority; and therefore they interrupted Him even in the midst of His teaching. But the form of their inquiry was official, and according to theocratical rule: the Jewish rulers had the right to demand of a man who exercised prophetic functions the warranty of His prophetical character. But, as Jesus had already abundantly authenticated Himself by various miracles, their seemingly justifiable act was only a shameless avowal of unbelief. It was no other than the highest rebellion in the disguise of strict legality.

The high priests and the elders.—That is, the Sanhedrin in its official authority. Hence Luke and Mark add the *scribes* also; for these belonged in a wider sense to the presbytery. **The high priests:** the plural is explained by the then existing relations of the high-priesthood. The high priest was supposed legally to enjoy his function during life (*see* Winer, art. *Hohepriester*); and before the exile we read of only *one* deposition (1 Kings ii. 27). But since the time of the Syrian domination the office had often changed hands under foreign influence; it was often a football of religious and political parties, and sometimes even of the mob. This change was especially frequent under the Roman government. Thus Annas (Ananus) became high priest seven years after the birth of Christ (Æra Dion.); seven years later Ishmael, at the command of the Roman procurator (Joseph. *Antiq.* xviii. 2, 2); afterward Eleazar, son of Annas; a year later, one Simon; and after another year, Joseph Caiaphas, a son-in-law of Annas. Thus Caiaphas was now the *official* high priest; but, in consistency with Jewish feelings, we may assume that Annas was honored in connection with him as the properly *legitimate* high priest. This estimation might be further disguised by the fact of his being at the same time the סגן, or vicar of the high priest (Lightfoot); or, if he was the נשיא, president of the Sanhedrin (Wieseler). Compare, however, Winer, *sub Synedrium.* That, in fact, high respect was paid to him, is proved by the circumstance that Jesus was taken to him first for a private examination (John xviii. 13). And thus he here appears to have come forward with the rest, in his relation of colleague to the official high priest. Moreover, the heads of the twenty-four classes of the priests might be included under this name. Probably the whole was the result of a very formal and solemn ordinance of the Council, at whose head stood the high priests.

By what authority?—(Comp. Acts iv. 7.) The two questions are not strictly the same. The first demanded His own authority, or what was the prophetic title which He assumed; the second demanded the authority from which He derived His own, and which authenticated Him. It therefore seems to have intimated that their authorization was denied to Him. Doubtless their aim was to extort from Him thus early that same declaration which they afterward (ch. xxvi.) construed into a criminal charge.

Doest Thou these things? ταῦτα.—Grotius, Bengel, and others refer the ταῦτα to *His teaching;* Meyer, on the contrary, to the cleansing the temple and the healing, ver. 14. Better, de Wette: The whole of the work of Jesus in the temple up to this time. As they would not acknowledge the acts of Jesus, the definite word ταῦτα is chosen with design.

Vers. 24, 25. **I also will ask you.**—The counter-question is once more a testimony to the heavenly supremacy of Christ's wisdom as a teacher. They had presented this inquiry under the pretext of theocratical rule; and, in the true spirit of this theocratical rule, He put to them His counter-question: **The baptism of John, was it from heaven?** that is, Did John act as a true prophet under divine authority? The antithesis, **or of men,** signifies his having come by his own arbitrary boldness, undertaking an enthusiastic work, supported by the party spirit of like-minded confederates. As the opposite of divine authority of the true prophet, the words still more definitely describe the character of the false prophet. Now if the Sanhedrin declared for the latter part of the alternative, they would not only come into collision with the faith of the people, but they would condemn themselves as having proved false to the theocracy, as the administrators of its laws. If, on the other hand, they acknowledged the divine mission of John, they must also acknowledge Jesus as the Messiah; for John had declared himself to be the forerunner of the Messiah, and he had moreover directed the people to Jesus as the Messiah. Indeed, the silent secret is here hinted at, that he had directed themselves—the Sanhedrin—to Jesus as the Messiah (*see* ch. iv.).

Ver. 25. **They deliberated among themselves.**—Their pondering must issue in a formal answer; and, as they must give a common answer, a common consultation and deliberate calculation was previously necessary: hence ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, *among themselves;* which also appears in the διαλογίζεσθαι. (*See* ch. xvi. 7.)—**Why then did ye not believe him?**—that is, his testimony concerning the Messiah.

Ver. 26. **We fear the multitude.**—We have the crowds (τὸν ὄχλον) to dread. Meyer assumes here an aposiopesis, which (Luke xx. 6) interprets: *All the people will stone us.* But the expression φοβούμεθα intimates the same in a more indefinite way. The ὄχλος is scornful: the mob, as in John vii. 49.

[The intelligence of this official consultation, which is related almost verbatim by the Synoptists, may have been originally derived from Nicodemus, who belonged to the Sanhedrin.—P. S.]

Ver. 27. **We do not know.**—This reminds us of the hierarchical decision, "*mandatum de supersedendo,*" which is so frequent in papal history; *e. g.*, in the conflict between Reuchlin and the Dominicans (*see* Ranke: *Deutsche Geschichte im Zeitalter der Reformation,* vol. i. p. 281). They were caught in a rough alternative, and could extricate themselves only by a step of desperation. The Sanhedrin were under the necessity, in the temple and in the hearing of all the people, to utter a confession of ignorance, and that of hypocritical ignorance. If they were not already enemies of Jesus to the death, this would make them so. This declaration made them, in the eyes of Jesus, cease to be a truly legitimate and divinely authorized Sanhedrin; after this, they were to Him only as usurpers. Hence His reply, **Neither tell I you.** [The οὐδὲ ἐγὼ λέγω is an answer not to their words: οὐκ οἴδαμεν, but to their inward thoughts: οὐ θέλομεν λέγειν.]

Ver. 28. **But what think ye?**—Now there is a transition to the offensive. *First Parable.*—Jesus had already by His counter-question obliged His enemies to lay bare their ignorance, or their unbelief. He now constrains them, in the first parable, to declare their own guilt; and, in the second, to declare their own punishment; and, as they had now decided to put Him to death, He describes to them, in the third parable, the consequences of their great violation of the covenant and ingratitude—the destruction of their ancient priesthood, and the triumphant establishment of His new kingdom of heaven among the Gentiles. The first parable is found only in Matthew.*

Ver. 30. **I will, sir,** Ἐγώ.—Not merely, *yes*, but an elliptical expression of devoted willingness, like the Hebrew הִנֵּנִי (Grotius). De Wette: It always refers to the previous verb: thus, ὑπάγω or ἐργάζομαι must be supplied. But the emphasis of the answer with *I* is to be regarded as intimating a contrast to the refusing son.

Ver. 31. **The publicans and the harlots.**—Thus, those who were excommunicated from the Jewish Church: the last word specializes the usual expression, *sinners.* They are represented by the first son. Their earlier relation to the requirements of the law and the prophets was a virtual *no*, which often in the expression of unbelief had become an actual and literal *no*. But, since the coming of the Baptist, they had repented. The contrast to them is the Sanhedrin in the second son. By their doctrine and hypocritical piety they had exhibited themselves as the obedient ones, yet with a boastful *I will, sir,* and with a contemptuous look upon the disobedient son. But they were the disobedient in relation to the Baptist and the Christ; they would not be influenced even by the example of the publicans' repentance.

Go before you, προάγουσιν.—Here intransitive: not of a "future," but of a present entering into the kingdom of God. But the following of the others is not intimated; rather the reverse. [According to Trench, on the contrary, the words imply that the door of hope was not yet shut upon the Pharisees by an irreversible doom, and that they might still follow, if they would. So also Alford and Nast. Comp. John xii. 35; and Christ's prayer on the cross, Luke xxiii. 34.—P. S.]

Ver. 32. **In the way of righteousness,** ἐν ὁδῷ δικαιοσύνης.—Meyer: "As a thoroughly righteous and upright man. It is not the preaching of righteousness which is meant." De Wette: "For he preached righteousness." That ὁδὸς often means doctrine, as a standard of practical righteousness, is a settled point (comp. ch. xxii. 16; Acts xiii. 10, etc.). But here we must understand the way of righteousness in reference to the words of Christ in John xiv. 6: *I am the way.* John came (ἔρχεσθαι of teachers arising, ch. xi. 18) as the forerunner of the Messiah, pointing to Him, the way of righteousness. The δικαιοσύνη here is analogous to the σοφία, ch. xi. 19.

Repented not.—Μεταμελέομαι here expresses the coming to a change of mind and purpose, and not merely "to meditate something better;" yet *repent* is rather too strong a translation, and corresponds to μετανοεῖν. Comp. ch. xxvii. 3; 2 Cor. vii. 8.

Ver. 33. **Hear another parable.**—[As if to

* [Trench (l. c. p. 185) remarks on these three parables that notwithstanding their severe and threatening aspect, they are not words of defiance, but of earnest, tenderest love, spoken with the intention of turning them, if possible, from their purpose, of saving them from the fearful outrage against His person which they were about to commit, and of winning them also for the kingdom of God. The parable of the Two Sons is rather retrospective, while the two that follow, are prophetic also.—P. S.]

say: "I have not done with you yet; I have still another word of warning and rebuke." Trench.] This second parable does not merely predict "the future punishment" of the enemies of the Messiah; it more definitely specifies the nature of their guilt, in its last and near approaching consummation, the murder of Christ.

Planted a vineyard.—The theocracy under the similitude of a vineyard: *see* Isa. v. 1–7; iii. 14; Cant. ii. 15. Israel the vine: Jer. ii. 21. Christ the vine: John xv. 1. [A vineyard was regarded as the most valuable plantation, which yielded the largest harvest, but required also the most constant labor and care. Cato says: *Nulla possessio pretiosior, nulla majorem operam requirit.*—P. S.]

A wine-press, ληνός.—Properly the trough which was buried in the ground; the wine-press proper stood above, and the juice flowed through a grated opening into it. But the press and the trough were also together called ληνός.

[The *digging*, of course, can only refer properly to the receptacle for the juice in the rock or ground to keep it cool (Mark has for it ὑπολήνιον = *lacus vinarius*); but ληνός = *torcular*, sometimes means the whole structure for treading the grapes and receiving the expressed juice. Dr. Hackett (*Illustrations of Scripture*, p. 157, 8th ed.), as quoted by Dr. Conant *in loc.*, gives the following description of it: "A hollow place, usually a rock, is scooped out, considerably deeper at one end than the other. The grapes are put into this trough, and two or more persons, with naked feet and legs, get into it, where they jump up and down, crushing the fruit. . . . The juice flows into the lower part of the excavation. . . . The place for treading out the grapes is sometimes dug in the ground, lined probably with a coating of stone or brick. The expression in Matt. xxi. 33 may allude to such an excavation."—P. S.]

Tower.—Watch-tower; generally built in vineyards [not so much for recreation as for the watchmen who guarded the fruits against thieves].

Let it out to husbandmen, ἐξέδοτο.—De Wette: For a part of the fruits. Meyer: For money, as the lord himself received the fruits, vers. 34, 41. But in Luke xx. 10 we have ἀπὸ τοῦ καρποῦ τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος, and hence de Wette must be right. If the ἐκδιδόναι had been used of money (it must be distinguished, even then, from the μισθοῦν of the laborers, ch. xx. 1, 7), the lord would have required of these husbandmen, not the fruits, but the rent. Meyer himself favors this explanation, when he makes τοὺς καρποὺς αὐτοῦ refer, not to the fruits of the vineyard, but to the fruits belonging to the lord.

Ver. 35. **Stoned another.**—Meyer: According to ch. xxiii. 37; John viii. 5; Acts vii. 58, etc., "this is related to killing as its climax, as *species atrox* (Bengel) of killing." But in the parallel of Mark, where λιθοβολήσαντες is sufficiently authenticated, we must understand it, that the servant was saluted from afar with stones. The climax is there, but of another kind: they did not let the third messenger come near them, but drove him away with stones. It must be remembered, that stoning is used here as part of the parable, not in the sense of the Jewish law.

[Ver. 37. **But last of all he sent unto them his son,** etc.—It has been frequently observed by ancient and modern commentators, that the only and well-beloved Son of God is here distinctly marked out as far above the prophets in dignity and rank, the sending of whom is the last and crowning effort of divine mercy, and the rejection of whom fills up the measure of human sin and guilt. Compare here the more expressive language of Mark xii. 6: "*Having yet therefore one son, his well-beloved, he sent him also last unto them, saying, they will reverence my son.*" The expression of the hope, that the husbandmen will reverence the son, implies, of course, no ignorance, but the sincere will of God, that all should be saved; and the fact of man's freedom and responsibility, which is perfectly consistent with Divine foreknowledge and foreordination, although we may not be able in this world to see the connection and to explain the mystery.—P. S.]

Ver. 38. **Let us have his inheritance,** καὶ σχῶμεν τὴν κληρονομίαν.—The reading κατάσχωμεν (*seize*), and the parallel in Mark xii. 7, contain the true explanation. That of Meyer, "And let us hold fast, not be driven out" (as if they did not mention the result, but their further design, what they would do after the killing of the son), gives no good sense. Till then, they regarded themselves as hired laborers; after killing the heir, they usurp the possession.

Ver. 39. **They cast him out of the vineyard, and slew him.**—Mark's inversion of the order exhibits the act in a more passionate and dramatic manner; but it loses a typical feature. For, the sequence in Matthew (and Luke) bears with it an undoubted allusion to the excommunication which preceded death. Chrysostom, Olshausen, and others refer the casting out to the crucifixion outside of Jerusalem; and they are so far right, as this was the consequence of the sentence and curse which rested on Jesus, Heb. xiii. 12.

Vers. 33–39. The Meaning of the Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen.—The *vineyard* is the theocratical kingdom of God, especially* in its Old Testament form. The *hedge* is the divine order of restriction and mark of membership: in the Old Testament, circumcision; in the New Testament, the power of the keys, and baptism with confession (Chrysostom and others: the law†). The *wine-press* is the altar in the widest sense (Chrysostom and others: the altar; in the New Testament also, the Lord's Supper ‡). The *tower* is the theocratical protection; or also the New Testament office of watchman ideally viewed (Chrysostom: the temple). We must hold fast the fundamental traits of the Mosaic law; yet so as to include the New Testament fulfilment, for the vineyard passes over in the New Covenant to other laborers. *The departure of the proprietor.* Bengel: *tempus divinæ taciturnitatis, ubi homines agunt pro arbitrio.* But against this speaks the fact, that the time of the prophets is described, and their mission is combined in one with the mission of Christ. It is rather the period of the natural human development of the kingdom of God from the date of its divine institution. *The laborers*, or *husbandmen*, are the official leaders

* [Not: *that is*, as the Edinb. translator (Rev. Mr. Pope) has it, evidently mistaking the German *namentlich* for *nämlich*, and thereby confining the vineyard to the Jewish church, when Lange expressly means to apply it to the Christian church also, as the connection clearly shows. Such errors are very frequent in this translation, especially in the few preceding and all tho subsequent chapters.—P. S.]

† [So also Trench who refers the hedge to the law which Paul calls "the middle wall of partition" between the Jew and the Gentile (Eph. ii. 14), and which was a hedge both of separation from, and defence against, Gentile abominations and hostile foreign influence. He refers it at the same time to the geographical isolation of Palestine.—P. S.]

‡ [Irenæus, Hilary, Ambrose, and others, take the wine-press to be a symbol of the prophetic institution.—P. S.]

of the theocracy, especially the priests, elders, and scribes. The *servants* are the prophets sent by God. For their *maltreatment*, *see* the flight of Elijah, the histories of Jeremiah and Zechariah (2 Chron. xxiv. 20), the tradition concerning Isaiah. The *son* is the Messiah. The attempt of the laborers to gain the inheritance for themselves, is the ambition of the Jewish rulers. The *coming of the lord* is the judgment of retribution.

Ver. 40. **When therefore the lord of the vineyard cometh.**—His enemies are constrained to explain the parable for themselves. But, inasmuch as their solution was a necessary consequence of their whole position, Mark and Luke represent Jesus as Himself drawing the conclusion. But they also put first the question, "What will the lord of the vineyard do?" Each representation is in harmony with the connection of each Gospel; but that of Matthew seems the original one. Meyer supposes that the Sanhedrin daringly gave their decision, although they felt that the parable referred to them; and in favor of this is the μὴ γένοιτο, Luke xx. 16. On this assumption, their apparent sincerity was only hypocrisy; and they thereby declared that the parable did not apply to them.

Ver. 41. **He will miserably destroy those miserable men.**—Meyer, well: As miserable ones will He miserably destroy them. *See* his examples, of the same phraseology. It signifies the theocratical judgments upon Israel, appearing in the destruction of Jerusalem; which Meyer, with his wonted misunderstanding of the advent, denies. The *Parousia* of Christ is consummated in His last coming, but is not one with it. It begins in *principle* with the resurrection (John xvi. 16); continues as a *power* through the New Testament period (John xiv. 3, 19); and is *consummated* in the stricter sense in the final advent (1 Cor. xv. 23; Matt. xxv. 31; 2 Thess. ii. etc.).

To other husbandmen.—The passing over of the kingdom of God to the Gentiles. The significance of this feature of the parable was not, probably, clearly seen by the Council. Remarkable is the praise which they finally lavish upon the new laborers. The meaning is, that the Lord will always know how to seek and to find faithful laborers in His work.

Ver. 42. **And Jesus said unto them.**—A parabolical word follows from the Old Testament, which gives its edge to the preceding parable; showing the Sanhedrin from the ancient Scriptures that most assuredly the parable suited them. The passage which the Lord brings to their remembrance is that of Ps. cxviii. 22 [the same Psalm of triumph from which the people had taken their Hosannas], quoted from the Septuagint. According to Ewald, this Psalm was sung at the first Feast of Tabernacles after the return from captivity. This much is certain, that it primarily pointed, in its historical sense, to the pious, mystical kernel of the people, as exalted above all the attempts of the heathen to destroy them. According to Zech. iii. 8, 9, and iv. 7, Zerubbabel was probably the person; but Zerubbabel was a type of the Messiah; therefore the passage was a typical prophecy of Christ, as the Rabbins always acknowledged. But as the stone is described as one rejected by the builders, this could hardly be said of the Gentiles, and must refer to the Jewish builders themselves, the priests and rulers, who first despised the stone and then rejected it. We have then here something that passes beyond historical type, and which makes the parable a striking prophecy of the conduct of the Sanhedrin toward Christ. And if the *corner-stone*, the stone which bears up the theocratical edifice, is distinguished from that building, it cannot signify all Israel, but the theocratical offspring of David, who is the definite type of the Messiah. Since the *corner-stone*, or *head of the corner* (κεφαλὴ γωνίας) binds together the two walls, Ammonius and Cyril found in this image the union of Jews and Gentiles in Christ.* But the idea here prominent is this, that the despised and rejected stone becomes the corner-stone of the theocracy. [Compare for a similar application of this Psalm in Acts iv. 11; 1 Pet. ii. 1.]

Ver. 43. **Therefore I say unto you.**—De Wette: "Therefore, because ye have rejected the corner-stone." Better: Because the word concerning the corner-stone shows that the parable spoken expressly suits you, the word also concerning the vineyard being given to others suits you also; the kingdom will be taken from you, etc. For this also speaks the expression: "*given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof.*"

To a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof.—The New Testament people of God, with emphasis upon the new and heterogeneous element, the Gentiles. Meyer: The Ἰσραὴλ κατὰ πνεῦμα.

Ver. 44. **Whosoever shall fall upon this stone,** etc.—The privative and negative punishment of the wicked laborers is followed by their positive punishment. Thus we have here an explanation of the words: "*He will miserably destroy these miserable men,*" connected with the figure of the stone, which now approves its rocky nature, that fitted it to be the corner-stone. Thus Christ also demonstrates that He is the Judge. The positive and punitive judgment has again its two sides. The stone falls on none who have not first fallen on it: that is, only the unbelievers, who have rejected Christ, will be by Him condemned and rejected. But it is a double form of punishment which is expressed by this antithesis. He who falls upon Christ, the corner-stone, or who runs against and falls over it, making Him a spiritual offence and stumbling-block, σκάνδαλον (Isa. viii. 14; comp. 1 Pet. ii. 8), will be *bruised*. This is death through dismemberment of the body: spiritual death, reprobation, and demolition of Israel, or of the individual unbeliever. This is the judgment which falls upon the active enemy of the passive Christ, as *subject*. But he will also be the passive *object* of the punishment of the glorified and governing Christ.

But on whomsoever it shall fall.—He against whom Christ comes in judgment—according to the figure of the stone, Dan. ii. 34, 35—will He **grind to powder,** λικμήσει; Vulgate †: *conterat;* Luther: *zermalmen, to crush, to pulverize.* Meyer maintains that the Greek verb can only mean, *shall winnow him,* throw him off as chaff. But this does not suit the effect of a falling stone. The expression is chosen with reference to the mysterious stone in Daniel, which grinds to powder the image of the monarchies; that is, to Christ, who unfolds His life in the kingdom of God, and grinds the kingdoms of the world to pow-

* [So also Origen, Jerome, Augustine, Chrysostom, Theophylact, and among modern commentators, Alford, Trench, and Wordsworth. *See* Eph. ii. 20-22.—P. S.]

† [The original substitutes the Greek *Septuagint* (which ought to be connected with the preceding λικμᾶν) for the Latin *Vulgate*,—an obvious oversight (doubtless of the printer, who may have omitted *Vulgate*), which the Edinb. translator, as usual, faithfully and thoughtlessly copies.—P. S.]

der. This is the actual and most proper result of His historical judgment: perfect dissolution of organization, dissipation of its elements even to apparent annihilation. The threatening here refers primarily to the Jewish hierarchy and the destruction of Jerusalem; but the unbelieving individual will also be ground to powder at last, the glory of his life will be dissipated, he will be reduced to his elements, and driven to the verge of annihilation.

Ver. 46. **They sought to lay hands on Him.**—They had already fixed the decree to kill Him. But their exasperation at the condemning import of the parables might have urged them at once to carry out their resolution, had not their dread of the people prevented them.

Ch. XXII. 1. **And Jesus answered.**—*The third parable: the Marriage of the King's Son.** The judgment upon Jerusalem and the Jews, and the new theocracy of the kingdom of heaven.—The Lord's further words are introduced as an answer, because they refer to the schemes of His enemies to seize Him.

In parables.—Plural of the category.

Ver. 2. **Made a marriage for his son.**—This parable is related, in its fundamental idea that the kingdom of heaven is a festive meal, to that of Luke xiv. 16–24. But there is an essential difference between them. The festive supper of a host is here expanded into a wedding supper which a king made for his son. In Luke the whole parable is so ordered as to depict the infinite goodness and grace of the Lord: hence the scornful guests are at once passed by, and the parable turns to those newly invited out of the streets and lanes. But in Matthew the judgment is the standpoint from which the whole is viewed. Hence not only is the judgment upon the first neglecters of the invitation depicted, but further judgment is extended to the guests who actually came. The practical scope of these parables has been altogether overlooked by those who have maintained that the former was the original parable, and that evangelical tradition pieced together in this one many separate fragments. (De Wette, Strauss, Schneckenburger, and others.) † Evangelical parables are not works of art in this sense. Their fundamental ideas may be viewed from different points of view, and differently developed accordingly. So here, when the Lord shows what judgments will fall upon the various kinds of contempt poured on the marriage supper of the kingdom of God. The Jews had long been wont to think of the festival of the consummated kingdom of heaven under the figure of a feast. The paschal meal, doubtless, gave them the type of it; while all the heathen festivals and sacrificial feasts rested upon the same common foundation. Comp. Exod. xxiv. 11; Ps. xxiii. 5; Isa. xxv. 6. This feast of the kingdom of heaven is an image of the blessedness and fellowship of the life of faith, and assumes a threefold form: 1. It is a feast in the future world, Luke xvi. 22; 2. it is the future feast at the visible advent of the Messiah, Luke xiv. 15; Matt. xxv. 1; 3. it is the present, spiritual feast which begins at once with

* [So it is called in the headings of the English Bible, to distinguish it from the parable of the *Great Supper* in Luke xiv. 16–24. Sometimes it is called less appropriately the parable of the *Wedding Garment*, which after all is only an episode in it.—P. S.]

† [Even Theophylact, Calvin, and Maldonatus maintain the identity of the two parables; while Olshausen, Stier, Nast, Alford, Trench, and Owen agree with Lange in keeping them distinct. Comp. the apt remarks of Trench on the difference and against Strauss, p. 209 sqq.—P. S.]

the life of faith, Ps. xxiii.; the parables, Luke xiv. 17, and in this section. The Jewish rabbinical mythology exhibited the feast at the end of the world, at the advent of the Messiah, with all sensuous characteristics, and in colossal figures. The change of the simple feast into a marriage supper rested upon the Old Testament representation of the covenant between Jehovah and Israel by the figure of the marriage state: Isa. liv. 5; Ezek. xvi. 4; ch. xxiii.; Hos. ii. 19, 20; compare the Canticles. In the New Testament development of this figure, we must, of course, regard the Messiah as the Bridegroom, for whom the Father prepared the marriage with the Church: Eph. v. 25; Rev. xxi. Calovius and many others have interpreted the wedding as the union of the divine and human natures in Christ.* And indeed, this union forms the ideal foundation and real root of the actual union and communion between Christ and His Church, which was typically foreshadowed by the union of Jehovah with Israel. Believers are here represented as guests; but this does not militate against the reference to Christ's relations with His Church, because the ideal Church in its totality must be regarded as the bride, and the individual Christians as guests. But certainly the bond of connection between Christ and His Church has its root in His assumption of His humanity by the assumption of His human nature. The expression γάμοι then is not to be generalized, and translated *feast.* "Michaelis, Fischer, Kuinoel, Paulus, and others have thought that only a feast in celebration of the receiving of the kingdom is meant. But the Messiah is the Bridegroom (ch. xxv. 1), whose betrothal is the establishment of His kingdom (comp. on Eph. v. 27)." Meyer.†

Ver. 3. **To call them that were bidden.**—An Oriental custom. The first invitation was an invitation to the feast generally; the second, to the beginning of the feast itself.

Ver. 4. **Behold .... my dinner,** τὸ ἄριστόν μου.—The introductory meal, which opened the series of wedding feasts; an early meal toward midday, not the same as the δεῖπνον.‡

* [The Edinb. trsl. here again reverses the sense of the original by adding: "*but we have no Scripture warranty for this*, and then omitting the following sentence altogether. A translator has no right to change the views of his author, unless it be honestly stated.—P. S.]

† [Falsely credited to *Lisco* in the Edinb. trsl. with the omission of all the names representing this view.—P. S.]

‡ [The Edinb. trsl., which usually retains the language of the Authorized Version, even where Dr. Lange's version and comments require an alteration, falsely gives the text in this case: MY SUPPER IS READY, and thereby contradicts both the English Version and Dr. Lange's comment. The term: ἄριστον, from ἦρι, *ear*-ly, means properly an early meal, but generally a late breakfast, lunch, *prandium*, taken about *midday*, comp. Joseph. *Antiq.* v. 4, 2 (while the early breakfast, taken at sunrise, was called ἀκράτισμα), and is uniformly rendered *dinner* in the E. V. (Matt. xxii. 4; Luke xi. 38; xiv. 12): δεῖπνον was the principal meal taken early in the evening, after the work and heat of the day, as now in large cities, and is always rendered *supper* (Mark vi. 21; Luke xiv. 12, 16, 17, 24; John xii. 2; xiii. 2, 4; xxi. 20; 2 Cor. xi. 20, "the Lord's supper;" Rev. xix. 9, "the marriage supper of the Lamb"), except in three passages, where it is rendered *feast* (Matt. xxiii. 6; Mark xii. 39; Luke xx. 46). The corresponding verbs are translated: *to dine* and *to sup*. Some have proposed to translate ἄριστον, *breakfast*, and δεῖπνον, *dinner*. But it would sound very strange to the English ear accustomed to the admirable idiom of his good Anglo-Saxon Bible to hear of "the Lord's *dinner*," and "the marriage *dinner* of the Lamb." In such cases the common sense and traditional reverence of English Christendom would tolerate no alteration. In our passage the ἄριστον is the beginning of the marriage feasts, which

Vers. 5, 6. **But they made light of it . . . but the rest.**—How is this difficult clause to be construed? As the words stand, a division into two parts is suggested, the first part being again subdivided into two:—1. But they made light of it, and went away: *a.* some to their fields; *b.* some to their merchandize. 2. But the rest, etc.—So Meyer, after de Wette: ἀμελήσαντες refers only to those who went away; for the remainder, ver. 6, acted in direct hostility (κρατήσαντες). But the contempt which is expressed by ἀμελήσαντες is the general term for the enmity which embraced them all in one guilt; and, accordingly, they are all together condemned afterward as φονεῖς. Fritzsche therefore is right in assuming an inexactness in the phrase, which should have been: οἱ δὲ ἀμελ. and οἱ μὲν ἀπῆλθον; as the Vulgate has it: *Illi autem neglexerunt, et abierunt,* etc. Yet the οἱ found wanting before ἀπῆλθον is contained in the following ὁ μὲν, ὁ δέ. Thus, οἱ δὲ ἀμελήσαντες: 1. ἀπῆλθον ὁ μὲν, ὁ δὲ; 2. οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ κρατήσαντες. The ἀμέλεια is the hostile unbelief which is common to all. This expresses itself in two ways: *a.* In the indifferent worldliness: they think nothing of their king, and devote themselves to their own private affairs. *b.* In fanatical spirituality, which makes the positive persecution of the servants (prophets) an official business. This is a striking picture of the miserable contrast of false worldliness and spirituality in the hierarchical communion.* Fundamentally, however, the contrast is only a reciprocal influence; and both dwell together in only one city of murderers, which was doomed to burning.

Ver. 9. **Out into the highways.**—Not the places where the streets of the city meet (Kypke, Kuinoel, and others); for the city is assumed to be burned, ver. 7; but the outlets of country roads (Fritzsche, Meyer).† At this point our parable goes beyond that of Luke xiv. 16. There, the streets and lanes of the city are mentioned, where the maimed and the poor gathered together (the halt, the lame, the blind: publicans and sinners within the theocracy). Here, the commission is to go far beyond the doomed city, out into the high roads of the world: all, both bad and good, the heathen simply, are invited; both those who were looking for light, and the common people of heathenism generally.

Ver. 10. **Both bad and good.**—Bengel: *locutio quasi adverbialis.* Meyer: They acted as if they would make no difference, whether the persons were morally good or bad, provided only they accepted the invitation; the distinction between them must be made by the king at a later period, and not by them. But in this interpretation, first, the distinction between the wicked and the good in the heathen world (Acts x.; Rom. ii.) is improperly done away with; and, secondly, it is not proper to confound the difference between the good and the bad among the invited, with the difference between the guests who had, and those who had not, the wedding-garment. The plan of salvation shines clearly through the whole; and that does not look at the previous life, but at faith or unbelief toward the gospel. The words: **they gathered together,** imply that they accepted the invitation with joy.

The wedding was furnished with guests.—With the filling of the wedding-chamber the wedding feast was consummated. The contemners of the feast could not do away with or invalidate it: it came to its full consummation.

Ver. 11. **To see the guests.**—At the thought of a calling of the Gentiles to the Messianic salvation the Pharisaic legality revolted with horror, as opening the gate to antinomianism and anarchy. Christ meets this aversion of the hierarchy with the doctrine that righteousness and judgment would pervade, though in *higher* and *nobler forms,* even the new economy of grace. And the idea of judgment is predominant throughout the whole parable. *The higher forms* of the spiritual law: 1. The guests are examined by the king; 2. the sign of worthiness is the wedding-garment; 3. the punishment is a personal and rigorous exclusion.

Not having a wedding-garment, ἔνδυμα γάμου.—Here, not merely "a garment suitable for a wedding feast" (de Wette), but specifically a wedding-garment. 1. Michaelis, Olshausen, and others interpret: The guests of kings were in the East presented with festal garments, or caftans, according to Harmar (*Observations on the East,* ii. 17) and others. This custom is assumed in the parable; and the figure is appropriate, the more so as saving righteousness, faith, and the Holy Spirit are likewise the gifts of God. But Fritzsche, Meyer, and de Wette object to this view. De Wette remarks "that such a custom cannot be sufficiently proved (Meyer: Not even by Gen. xlv. 22; Judg. xiv. 12; 2 Kings v. 22; x. 22; Esth. vi. 8; viii. 15); and that there could be no reason why an invited guest should despise the festive garment." 2. They therefore suggest another explanation: "That the guests were bound to come with festal clothing, was an obvious and customary propriety that needed no enforcement. Moral δικαιοσύνη was thereby symbolized, which men, after the call to the kingdom of the Messiah, should obtain for themselves through the μετάνοια." So Meyer; without, however, giving any more precise explanation of this moral δικαιοσύνη.* De Wette: "The view here obtains, that the spirit which is appropriate to the kingdom of God depends upon man himself." But where could guests get these garments in the urgency of the feast, especially as they were men of all kinds (according to Luke's parable, probably many of them beggars)? The passages quoted by Meyer show at least that the custom of furnishing the guests with festive garments on such occasions was very ancient in the East.† And

culminate in the marriage *supper* of the lamb, Rev. xix. 9. —P. S.]

* [In German: *in dem hierarchischen Gemeinwesen,* which the Edinb. edition has rendered: *ecclesiastical nature!*]

† [Alford and Trench refer διέξοδοι to the city, *i. e.*, not the city of the murderers (Jerusalem), but the city in which the marriage was supposed to be celebrated. TRENCH, p. 220: "We must not permit our English *highways* to suggest places in the country as distinguished from the town; the image throughout is of a city, in which the rich and great and noble, those naturally pointed out as a king's guests, refuse his banquet, whereupon the poor of the same city are brought in to share it."—P. S.]

* [In the fourth edition of his Commentary, MEYER adds: "This δικαιοσύνη was to be obtained gratuitously by faith for the sake of the death of Christ; but the knowledge of this doctrine was reserved to the later development of the Christian faith." Similarly ALFORD: "The garment is *the imputed and inherent* [?] *righteousness of the Lord Jesus,* put on *symbolically* in Baptism (Gal. iii. 27), and *really* by a true and living faith (Gal. iii. 26),—without which none can appear before God in His kingdom of glory;—Heb. xii. 14; Phil. iii. 7, 8; Eph. iv. 24; Col. iii. 10; Rom. xiii. 14:—which truth could not be put forward *here,* but at its subsequent manifestation threw its great light over this and other such similitudes and expressions."—P. S.]

† [Compare also what Trench adduces from modern travellers and modern customs in the East, which are likely to

the man might have excused himself by his poverty, if it were not assumed that every one might have received his wedding-garment. However, we must not lay any more stress upon the idea that the garment was presented, than upon the notion that every one must provide it for himself. There is no feature in the parable which specially points to the one or the other of these assumptions. The stress lies upon this, that every one must be found at the wedding in a wedding-garment, and that he must therefore have previously taken pains in the matter. The question, how that trouble was to be taken, and how the garment was to be obtained, is designedly avoided, because another point of view is here the more important. If the guest had not taken any pains about the wedding-garment, he showed positive disrespect to the inviting lord, and a contempt for his feast, or Antinomianism. The free gift of righteousness as such cannot here be meant; as that consists in the invitation to the supper and the participation of the feast. Nor is faith as such intended; for that takes place at the acceptance of the invitation itself. Therefore, the wedding-garment is the exhibition of character, or appearance, corresponding to the invitation and the feast: that is, discipline of spirit, an earnest Christian life.* The first historical figure in which this guest comes before us in the apostolical history, is that of the Antinomians, who are depicted in the Second Epistle of Peter and the Epistle of Jude, and the Nicolaitanes of the Apocalypse. If it is still thought necessary to supply the deficient point (which, however, tends to weaken the main impression), we may say that the wedding-garment was at once freely given and obtained by personal effort. It was given as free grace; yet it was to be obtained in the ante-chamber by earnest effort and prayer. The chief point is, that it was obtained by diligent anxiety, springing from a right appreciation of the dignity of the feast.

Ver. 13. **Bind him hand and foot.**—An appropriate punishment of lawlessness. It had not for its object merely to keep him fast in his place of punishment, but also to carry him there securely; for, as he was a desperately bold intruder, he could not otherwise be driven out and carried away. The binding is the hard political restraint which follows on lawlessness. It is the business, not of the guests of the church, but of the servants of the King.—**Outer darkness.**—Comp. ch. viii. 12. It may be worthy of notice, that the Antinomians are cast out into the same place of punishment with the traditionalists and legalists. This points to an internal connection between the two extremes.

There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.—*See* above. There is no sufficient reason for separating these words from the parable, as Meyer does, and making them explanatory words of Christ.

Ver. 14. **For many are called.**—If we take these words as simply the Lord's explanation, they refer not only to the punishment of the one guest, who had not on the wedding-garment, but to those also who had been earlier invited; and thus the antithesis of the *many* and *few* is better established and illustrated. Comp. ch. xx. 16. *Called* and *chosen* signify here not merely a difference, but an antithesis. Both in the old and in the new economy there is a rigorous separation made between the worthy and unworthy, and on that this antithesis is founded. We must not, therefore, understand the word here in its common doctrinal meaning; it is no more than the historical call or invitation, and the *called* are simply the individual members of the theocracy, and of the Christian Church. And so, further, the idea of *election* here is not the usual dogmatic conception of an eternal decree, but that final election in the judgment which, however, points back to the first election. De Wette goes no further, in his exposition, than the definite sentence of the Judge upon the worthiness and unworthiness of men. Meyer interprets it of the eternal decree by which God appointed those to enter into the kingdom of the Messiah who would appropriate His righteousness, ch. xxv. 34 (essentially the Arminian view). Perhaps it is better to go no further here also than the historical illustration. Many are called; few, as actual guests, have escaped as elect ones the two crises of judgment. Probably the expression rests upon some proverbial saying, such as, *Many guests, few elect ones*. The Scripture doctrine of election is the basis of the saying; but it is an election which is here viewed in all its developments and processes down to the judgment-day.

Vers. 1–14. THE MEANING OF THE PARABLE OF THE MARRIAGE OF THE KING'S SON. It speaks everywhere for itself. God is the King, and the wedding of His Son is the feast of the Messiah's kingdom. The invited, who have a second invitation, are the Jews. The second invitation came through John the Baptist and Jesus Christ. The city burnt is Jerusalem. The second sending of the servants is the mission of the Apostles. The highways are the heathen world. Good and bad are the whole body of heathen, receiving a common and unlimited proclamation of the gospel. The other traits—the general acceptance, etc.—have been already sufficiently

date from very ancient times, p. 225. Horace tells of Lucullus (*Epist.* i. 6, 40) that he had not less than five thousand mantles in his wardrobe. Chardin says of the king of Persia that he gave away an infinite number of dresses (*Voyage en Perse*, vol. iii. p. 230). Owen, like Lange, urges the obvious impossibility that the guests, especially the poor ones, could provide themselves with costly garments in so short a time, unless they were ready in the king's palace. "It must be remembered," he says, "that these guests were invited and brought in from the very highways, along which they were passing for pleasure or business, and it is very unreasonable to suppose that they were, or could be, provided, at so short a time, with appropriate dresses. Many of them were doubtless too poor to meet the expense of such a garment, had time been given them to procure one. On the other hand, we have abundant evidence, that kings were provided with extensive wardrobes, from which each invited guest was furnished with a suitable garment."—P. S.]

* [The Fathers, the Roman Catholic and some Protestant commentators, understand the *wedding-garment* to mean *charity* or *holiness*; most of the older Protestant commentators, *faith*; John Gerhard, Olshausen, Trench, Brown, and others, combine the two in the conception of *Christ*, or *righteousness*, both in its root of faith and its flower of charity, or "faith as the investing power, charity as the invested robe," in putting on Christ (Gal. iii. 27). Comp. Isa. lxi. 10: "I will greatly rejoice in the Lord, my soul shall be joyful in my God; for *He hath clothed me with the garments of salvation, He hath covered me with the robe of righteousness*, as a bridegroom decketh himself with ornaments, and as a bride adorneth herself with jewels." Trench explains it of "righteousness in its largest sense, the whole adornment of the new and spiritual man, including the faith without which it is impossible to please God (Heb. xi. 6), and the holiness without which no man shall see Him (Heb. xii. 14), or like this guest, only see Him to perish at His presence; it is at once the faith which is the root of all graces, the mother of all virtues, and likewise those graces and those virtues themselves." A singular curiosity in modern exegesis is the interpretation of Wordsworth, who soberly refers the wedding-garment to *baptism* "as the germ of all the means of spiritual grace," and applies the rebuking ἑταῖρε, *friend*, especially to the *Quakers*, or *Friends*, because they reject the visible signs and means of spiritual grace, provided for and prescribed to all by the Great King! The white baptismal garment in the ancient church must serve as an illustration in the absence of proof.—P. S.]

explained. Lampe understood by the wedding-garment Christ Himself: we regard it as the moral excellence of the Christian character. Judas has been discerned in the man without the garment (ἑταῖρε, ch. xxvi. 50); but the connection shows that this man is the collective Antinomianism of the New Testament economy.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *See* the foregoing *Exegetical Notes.*

2. His enemies would oppress and destroy the Lord through the might of their theocratic hierarchical authority. But He constrained them, by the might of His wisdom, to pronounce before the people in the temple the sentence of their own deposition and degradation. By the question concerning the origin of John's baptism He accomplished three things: 1. He constrained them to make manifest how much they differed from the belief of the people in the prophetic mission of the Baptist. 2. He brought home to their minds their own guilt, in having rejected the Baptist's express authentication of His claims as the Messiah.* 3. He rendered it necessary that they should pronounce their own sentence upon themselves as utterly incompetent to discharge the duties of their office. Thus the defensive was turned already into the offensive. But the special attack upon them, to which He now passes on, unfolds their guilt and its punishment in perfect gradation; and here again they are obliged to pronounce sentence upon themselves. Despisers of John, the prophet of repentance, worse than the publicans and harlots! this is the first sentence. That of the second is—Unfaithful stewards of the Lord's vineyard, murderers of the Messiah, condemned, deprived of their office, degraded, and forced to make way for strangers better than themselves!—this is the second sentence. Being with the whole people insane despisers of God and His salvation, and in all their acts rebels against Him, their city is to be burned, while they themselves are to be destroyed and to give place to the Gentiles!—this is the third sentence, which the Lord Himself utters in an allegorical prophecy. In all these mark the gradation of their guilt. In the first parable they are, by their "I will, sir," condemned, as well as by the repentance of the publicans and harlots. In the second parable they are condemned by the favorable terms on which the vineyard is let to them, by the long forbearance of the Proprietor, by the bold generosity with which He at last committed to them His Son. In the third parable, by the dignified invitation of their King to the wedding of His Son, as if they were friends, while at the same time they are subjects, and might be commanded; by the repetition of the call, and the anxious, almost supplicating, manner in which the preparations are spoken of, and the probable embarrassment caused by their absence; but, most of all, by the emptiness of their excuses, and the stupid malignity of their vengeance upon the messengers who invited them.

3. The appendix in the second parable perfects its application to the Council; but at the same time unfolds the two sides of the judgment which falls upon the builders who rejected the corner-stone. The corner-stone of Ps. cxviii., which the builders rejected, thus securing their own rejection, is made here, on the one hand, a figure of Isaiah's suffering Messiah (the stone of stumbling in Israel's way, Is. viii. 14, 15), by the contemptuous rejection of whom the enemies of the Messiah pronounced their own spiritual condemnation; and, on the other hand, it is made a figure of Daniel's glorified Messiah (the rock which descended from the highest mountain of the earth into the valley), who in the judgments of history annihilated His enemies. But the second part of the third parable is a justification of the hint, that the kingdom of God passes over to the Gentiles. Hence it is shown that law, justice, and judgment are to rule in the new economy, although in another and a higher form.

4. The marriage of the Son.—The call to the kingdom of God is a call to the highest honor, the highest joy, and the highest festivity. The inviting king is God; the bridegroom is Christ; the bride (not here appearing) the Church. The fact that the invited who accept the invitation belong to the body, which is the bride, comes not into view in the parable. Believers individually are the guests; believers collectively are the bride. The guests are the subjects of the king: He might constrain them as servants to do the work of servants, but He invites them as guests and friends to partake of His honors and joys, and invites them even with urgency. The motives of honor, love, duty, here all co-operate in their influence. And this makes the conduct of the first invited all the more unnatural and damnable.

5. "It does seem strange that the invited guests ill-treat and kill the messengers, who invite them to make their appearance; but what if this senseless conduct in the parable were designed to point to the equal folly of those who are now acting in the same senseless way with regard to God's messages!"—Weisse (ii. p. 113).

6. At the end of this section, the theocratical authority of Christ has taken the place of the old and forfeited authority. The Sanhedrin had now only the *form* of authority remaining with it. Essentially it was displaced by Christ.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

I. THE WHOLE SECTION.—The spiritual and real reckoning between Christ and the Sanhedrin points to the future open and historical reckoning.—The full development of the fall of Israel. 1. Their sin: (*a*) Disobedience under the guise of piety; (*b*) persecution of the prophets; (*c*) the murder of Christ; (*d*) contempt of God, and self-exclusion from the gospel feast. 2. Their judgment: (*a*) Put to shame by publicans and harlots and Gentiles; (*b*) degradation from their dignity and historical vocation; (*c*) loss of their land; (*d*) burning of their city; (*e*) and total downfall of all their glory.—Mark the fate of every hierarchical dominion which, like that of the Jews, withstands the Lord.

II. THE QUESTION OF THE SANHEDRIN; *Christ's counter-question*, ch. xxi. 23–32.—Christ is the spiritual avenger of the Baptist's blood in the temple.—The Lord in his House obliged to defend His rights; outraged by servants, and treated by them as a usurper.—Christ the conqueror of all hierarchical spirits in the temple of God. The supreme authority of the Lord robs all other authority here of its power.—The silencing of the Council: their silence was a sign of their desperation and of their hardening.—Connection of false prudence and fear: 1. False prudence begets fear; 2. fear begets false prudence.

—Before the Lord in His holy temple must all the world keep silence.

III. The Parable of the Two Unequal Sons.—The open, and the false character.—The penitent sinner held up by the Lord to put to shame the hypocrite.—The Lord's sermon of repentance in the temple.

IV. The Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen, ch. xxi. 33–41.—The fearful wickedness of God's laborers, who would turn His vineyard into a private possession. 1. The sources of this conduct: Misunderstanding of the Lord's external absence, of His longsuffering and tenderness; selfishness, worldliness, ambition, evil company. 2. The form of its manifestation: Denial of the fruits; contempt of the messengers; renunciation of the Lord; conspiracy against the Heir. 3. The issue of this conduct: Displacement from their vocation; loss of the vineyard; and terrible ruin.—The ruinous delusion of the servants of Christ who turn an office of service into an office of rule.—The ordinary offices in the Church are lost, when they fail to recognize the Lord's extraordinary messengers.—The murder of Christ in the vineyard of His Father; John iii. 16: So God loved the world, etc.—The history of the hardening of Israel an eternal warning to the Church.—They knew the Son and they knew Him not (Luke xxiii. 34; Acts iii. 17); their blindness was a self-inflicted obscuration of their minds.—In Christ's end the guilt of the whole world is summed up.—How He made His enemies pronounce their own doom.

V. Christ the Stone Rejected by the Builders, which became the Head of the Corner, ch. xxi. 42–46.—As the Old Testament foretold the degeneracy of His officers, so did also the New.—Christ the rock: 1. The stone which the builders rejected, and who was made the corner-stone (Ps. cxviii.); 2. the stone in the way, a stumbling-block and a stone to rest upon (Isa. viii.); 3. the rock which, hewn out, rolled down from the everlasting hills (Dan. ii.).—How unbelief turns the warning of ruin into a new and ruinous snare.—How the fear of the people's faith restrained the enemies of the Lord in their assaults.—The embarrassment and impotence of the Jewish Council: 1. Pressed within by the spiritual words of the Lord; 2. pressed without by the people's temper.—The malignity of unbelief reaches its climax in the feeling of its own impotence.

VI. The Marriage of the King's Son. The old Scripture lesson for the twentieth Sunday after Trinity. Ch. xxii. 1–14.—The kingdom of heaven a wedding feast, which God has prepared for His Son.—All preaching of the gospel is an invitation to this wedding.—Two kinds of guilt in dealing with the invitation: 1. Contempt of the invitation: dishonoring (*a*) the King, (*b*) the King's Son, (*c*) the inviting messengers. 2. Contempt of the feast itself: (*a*) dishonoring the blessedness of the feast in gross carnality and service of the world; (*b*) dishonoring the holiness and consecration of the feast, in preferring the beggarly fellowships of the world.—The guilt of remaining away, and the guilt of appearing ill (without the wedding-garment).—The difference and the common glory of the Old and New Covenants. 1. The difference: the Old Testament is the invitation to the feast; the New Testament is the feast itself. 2. The common glory: grace runs through the whole of the Old Covenant as well as the New; and the spirit of judgment and justice runs through the New Covenant as well as the Old (the guests are examined).—The best thing in our earthly life is, that in it we are invited to the feast of the salvation of God.—The true and proper loss of life in life is the despising the invitation to God's great feast.—How God in His mercy condescends to represent Himself as an embarrassed host, who fears for the dishonoring of His feast, and prays us to come.—All God's martyrs are persecuted messengers of invitation.—How it can come to pass that unbelief should rise in rebellion against the invitation to the free gift of blessedness.—Indifference which undervalues salvation in the midst of earthly cares, and fanaticism which persecutes the heralds of the gospel, are fundamentally one and the same self-seeking worldliness, though assuming different forms.—All God's judgments are the counterparts or antitheses of slighted feasts and invitations.—The Lord's armies, which He sends out for retribution (Romans, etc.); or, heaven and earth must contend for the honor of the Lord and His Son.—All the endless confusion of the course of this world must subserve the *one* clear end of God.—The passing over of the kingdom of heaven from the first invited to the new guests.—The ingratitude of those who would not come cannot invalidate the feast: the wedding is fully furnished and crowded nevertheless.—In the Church of the gospel the law is born again.—Friend, how camest thou in hither? or, lawlessness (Antinomianism) in the Church, and its judgment.—Holy discipline of the Church of Christ, the rule of Christ in the midst of it.—The eternal consecration of the eternal feast of Christ.—*Outer darkness;* or, the punishment of the servants of men's precepts, and the scorners of the law, the same.—*Many are called*, etc., or the difference between the external and the internal Church: (*a*) called, elect; (*b*) many, few; (*c*) remaining without, new and different guests.

Selections from other Homiletical Commentaries.

1. The Question and the Counter-Question.—*Starke:*—From *Zeisius:* The anti-christian spirit arrogates to itself all power in the Church, and will lord it over all things (2 Thess. ii. 4).—Spiritual councils, synods, and consistories, not only may err, but have erred, and err to this day; so that we must not obey them further than they conform to the word of God.—Most necessary it is to use prudence in dealing with the enemies of the truth.—Sometimes the cunning of the enemy can be met and unmasked by a little counter-question.

Gerlach:—The mysterious answer which Jesus had given them the first time (John ii.) had remained dark to their minds.—Christ's counter-question was by no means a mere evidence of His prudence, or an evasive reply; but He opens up to His enemies the way to acknowledge His Messiahship, for if they believed in John, they must receive his testimony concerning Jesus as the Messiah.

2. The Two Sons.—*Starke:*—Two sorts of men: manifest sinners, and hypocrites.—*Quesnel:* What would have been to man, in a state of innocence, pleasure, is now hard work on account of sin.—*Cramer:* To sin is human, but to continue in sin is devilish.—We must never give up all hope of the vilest sinner.—Behold, Jesus receiveth the vilest sinners, publicans and harlots!—*Hedinger:* Hypocrites promise much and keep little.—Obstinate persons are hard to convert.—Good examples of penitents should draw sinners to follow them.

Heubner:—The first application is to the persons named in ver. 31; the second, to the Jews and Gentiles. But the parable is for all men generally.—Those that are converted late often become more acceptable to God than those who are relapsing from early zeal.—The summoning "*Go work*" is for every man.—True improvement comes from action, not from wishing and promising.

3. THE WICKED HUSBANDMEN.—*Starke*:—From *Quesnel*: Ministers of the divine word must regard their flocks as a vineyard of the Lord.—The rulers of the Church are often its greatest persecutors, and most responsible for its corruptions.—The Son of God is heir of all things: whosoever rejects Him here has no part in the heavenly inheritance.—Those who cast Jesus out of their hearts, cast Him also out of the vineyard which He purchased with His blood.—*Zeisius*: The wicked are very often made unconsciously to bear witness against themselves.—The time of retribution will come.

Gerlach:—The number of the prophets increased in the later ages of the Israelitish people; so also, the longer the Church lives, the further the individual advances, the more abundant are the tokens of God's grace.—*He sent his son* (xxi. 37, comp. Heb. i. 2). Important passage, showing how Christ essentially distinguished Himself from all the former messengers of God, by His own peculiar relation to His heavenly Father.—The husbandmen know the son: thus Christ declares that His enemies knew who He was, or at least that they were guilty of their own ignorance. He tells them also why they watched for His life: because they feared He would take from them their usurped authority.—Human nature, in rebellion against Christ, has a right instinct, that if it could overcome *Him*, it would overcome *all* opposition.

Heubner:—The high priests acted as the agents or representatives of the evil spirit, the prince of this world. If Jesus could be destroyed, all would be won for Satan.—The Church of Christ often the stage of most frightful cruelty.—God's judgments become more and more severe.—The Jewish people a monument of divine mercy and justice.

4. THE CORNER-STONE.—*Starke*:—From *Canstein*: The corner-stone of the Church is Christ: 1 Cor. iii. 11; Eph. ii. 20; 1 Pet. ii. 6–8.—The Saviour falls on no one as a judgment, who has not already by unbelief stumbled at Him.—So blind are the ungodly, that they fear men, while they have no fear of God.

Heubner:—The Old Testament had foretold the rejection of the Son of God; the New Testament foretells to us the apostasy from Christianity,* for the warning and confirmation of believers.—Jesus honored the Scripture, and everywhere saw in it the counsel of God indicated. Ought not this to inspire the Christian with reverence for the Old Testament?—What wise one of this world, what human reason, would have conceived, under the cross, that this man, hanging suspended between two malefactors, and despised by all, would one day receive the worship of the whole world?—This is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes.—Vain are all attempts and devices to suppress the truth, or thwart the counsel of God.—It is madness to rush against the rock: it is for us only to rest and build on.—The doom of the despisers of God's grace.

5. THE WEDDING FEAST, ch. xxii. 1–14.—*Starke*:—The blind world often regards the good messengers, who invite them to a heavenly feast, as their enemies.—God is great, not only in His love, but also in His anger.—*Cramer*: Joyful word: All things are ready! Alarming word: Thou art not ready!—*Osiander*: Let all take care that they do not slight the gospel, that God may not take away His word ("and give it to others").—*Quesnel*: In the work of salvation there is no respect of persons.—*Cramer*: In heaven there are only good, in hell only wicked; but in the militant Church there are tares and wheat together (Gregor. *M. Homil.* 38).—He was speechless: Job ix. 3; Ps. cxxx. 3.—*Zeisius*: The small number of the elect should make no Christian despond, or weaken his hope of salvation; but only cause him to rub all sleep out of his eyes.—Not external communion with the Church, but divine election through faith, saves us.

Gerlach: The wedding feast of the Son of God with mankind, when He assumed our flesh.—The highways, the places where men most congregate.

Heubner:—*My dinner*. God has made all provision for our salvation, and that in the most abundant manner.—The climax: 1. *Seize*, hold fast and imprison, those to whom all houses and hearts should be opened; 2. *Scorn*, despise in word and act, those to whom men are bound to show the greatest respect and love; 3. *Kill*, those for whom the longest life should be desired.—Christianity is offered to us without merit.—The wisdom of God knows even how to derive good from evil.—The Jews' contempt for the gospel sent it over to the Gentiles.—All without distinction are invited.—Different receptions of the invitation to the kingdom of heaven.—The goodness and earnestness of the call of mercy.

Hofacker:—The righteous judgment of God upon those who obey not the gospel.—*Reinhard*:—The predominant spirit of every age furnishes its own pretexts for repelling the appeals of the gospel.—*J. J. Rambach*:—The vain hope of false Christians.

[Comp. also *Matthew Henry*, on the parable of the Marriage Feast, on which he is quite full and rich for practical purposes.—P. S.]

* [In German: *den Abfall* VOM CHRISTENTHUM, *from Christianity*, not *of Christendom*, as the Edinb. trsl. has it, which would require in German: *den Abfall* DER CHRISTENHEIT.—P. S.]

B. *The Attack of the Herodians or the Politicians, and the Victory of the Lord.* CH. XXII. 15–22.

(Mark xii. 13–17; Luke xx. 20–26. *The Gospel for the 23d Sunday after Trinity.*)

15 Then went the Pharisees, and took counsel how they might entangle [ensnare, en-
16 trap] him in *his* talk [with a word, ἐν λόγῳ].[1] And they sent out unto him their dis-
ciples with the Herodians,[2] saying, Master, we know that thou art true, and teachest
the way of God in truth, neither carest thou for any *man* [one, οὐ—οὐδενός]: for thou
17 regardest not the person of men. Tell us therefore, What thinkest thou? Is it lawful
18 to give tribute unto Cesar, or not? But Jesus perceived [knowing, γνούς] their wick-
19 edness, and said, Why tempt ye me, *ye* hypocrites? Shew me the tribute money [τὸ
20 νόμισμα τοῦ κήνσου]. And they brought unto him a penny [denáry].[3] And he saith
unto them, Whose *is* this image and superscription [the inscription, ἡ ἐπιγραφή]?
21 They say unto him, Cesar's. Then saith he unto them, Render[4] therefore unto Cesar
the things which are Cesar's [the things of Cæsar to Cæsar, τὰ Καίσαρος Καίσαρι]; and
unto God the things that are God's [the things of God to God, τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ τῷ Θεῷ].
22 When they had heard *these words*, they marvelled, and left him, and went their way.

[1] Ver. 15.—[Ὅπως αὐτὸν παγιδεύσωσιν (from παγίς, a *snare*, a *trap*) ἐν λόγῳ, Lange: *um ihn (mit List) zu fangen in einem Ausspruch;* Ewald: *durch ein Wort.* The *word* here refers to the artful question in ver. 17, to which, they thought, He must either answer *yes* or *no*, and in either case fatally compromise Himself. MEYER: "*ἐν λόγῳ, in einer Rede, d. h., in einem Ausspruche, welchen er thun würde. Dieser ist als Falle oder Schlinge* (παγίς) *gedacht.*" In Cod. Sinait. the words: ἐν λόγῳ, are omitted.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 16.—[Dr. Lange inserts after Herodians in small type: "Politicians, adherents of the Roman party of the Herodian house."—P. S.]

[3] Ver. 19.—[Δηνάριον. *See* the *Critical Notes* on xviii. 28 and xx. 2.—P. S.]

[4] Ver. 21.—[Ἀπόδοτε, *reddite*, render as a *due*, not: δότε, *date*, as a *gift*. Comp. Rom. xiii. 7: ἀπόδοτε οὖν πᾶσι τὰς ὀφειλάς. *Render unto all their dues.* Tertullian (*De idol.* 15): "*Reddite imaginem Cæsari quæ in nummo est, et imaginem Dei Deo quæ in homine est.*"—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 15. **Then went the Pharisees.**—The Pharisees formed the main element in the deputation of the Sanhedrin, which aimed to annihilate the Lord by a stroke of authority. But their blow He had made to recoil upon themselves. They stood as persons who were stripped of their spiritual authority; while He, by the same words which stripped them, demonstrated His own Messianic power, and remained in the temple as its actual Lord. His authority with the people, which it was sought to impair, was thus strengthened anew. His enemies enter into the fact of their position; yet not with repentance and obedience, but with a hypocritical acknowledgment, that they might again ensnare Him by cunning. This they could compass only by bringing Him into suspicion of the crime, of which they were themselves conscious, of exciting machinations against the Roman government. They wanted a political Messiah: that He would not become. They now sought to involve Him in the appearance of being a political Messiah, in order that they might hand Him over to the Roman authorities as an insurrectionary. They would suggest to Him, or impose upon Him, the sedition of their own hearts, that thus they might ruin Him. Thus they went further and further into the most abandoned course of lying, urged by the exasperation which His last great warning parables had provoked to the uttermost. How great this exasperation was, appears from the fact that it was the Pharisees of the Sanhedrin, the bitterest enemies of Rome, who made this attack, and connected themselves, for the accomplishment of their purpose, with the Herodian political party. And the greatness of their obduracy and blindness appears in this, that after all they actually brought Him to the cross under the charge of being a political Messiah, although He rebuked and repelled every solicitation to utter a seditious word. They hoped to succeed in their temptation, because they were blinded by the spirit of absolutism which regards every departure from its laws and demands as rebellion and revolution.

And took counsel.—It is a counsel of cunning. Their purpose is now to confront Him as private persons, who have much respect for His person; and for this purpose they have a perilous question ready. Hence the new assault upon our Lord assumes the form of a series of distinct party attacks. The Pharisees take the lead with theirs; and theirs was, indeed, the most cunningly devised. The Sadducees then follow, in an attack more direct and outspoken, though equally disguised as to its ultimate purpose. And then come, lastly, the scribes of the Pharisees' party, and try their strength on His.

Ver. 16. **Their disciples with the Herodians.**—It was part of the cunning of this new attack, that the Pharisees—the most dignified members of the Sanhedrin—who had just officially encountered Jesus, did not now appear before Him in the new character of hypocritical submission. He should by no means know their design. Hence they sent their disciples, young and unknown persons, who were students of the science of expounding Scripture. But for these they had been able to provide an accompaniment of political partisans, Herodians, probably also of the younger sort. They were the high-born academical youth of Jerusalem: an appropriate organ to use in a temptation to theocratical revolution around the temple of Zion. Meyer: "The Herodians were that party of the Jews who were devoted to the royal house of Herod—a party political, not hierarchical,

yet not purely Roman; popular royalists, in opposition to the pure principle of the theocracy, but also to the unpopular Roman dominion (against Cæsar), siding with the powerful Pharisees from policy and according to circumstances. For other and in part very singular interpretations, *see* Wolf and Köcher *in loc.** The passage in Joseph. *Antiq.* xiv. 15, 10, refers to other circumstances, comp. Ewald, p. 196. To regard them as adherents of the Roman government generally (and not specifically a faction devoted to the Herodian family), is forbidden by the special name which they bore. It was deep cunning in the hierarchy to unite themselves with this royalist faction; for thus they hoped to embolden Jesus to utter a word which might be interpreted against the census-tribute. Their flattering introduction had this design; and their further plan was to urge a political complaint against Him before the Roman authorities. Comp. Luke xx. 20. But, should an *affirmative* answer upset this scheme, they would at least succeed in placing the Herodians in antagonism to Him." Rather, they would in this case make Him hateful to the people, in consequence of His unconditional testimony in favor of subjection to the Roman dominion. The Herodians were, after all, anti-theocratic in their sentiments, and could only wear the mask of a patriotic royalism, which might serve as a temptation to the Lord. A third contingency, that Jesus might decline giving any answer, His opponents seem scarcely to have at all contemplated. It may have occurred to their minds, however, that they might possibly use Him yet as a tool in a gigantic rebellion.

Master, we know.—A cunning hint,† that they were ready to pay Him honor as the Messiah. In a sincere spirit Nicodemus said the same thing, John iii. 2.

That Thou art true: truthful.—With all their deceit, they actually thought this. The most abandoned falsehood is constrained to acknowledge His pure sincerity.

Thou teachest the way of God in truth.—Hypocritical recognition, (1) of His doctrine, and (2) of His manner of teaching or His orthodoxy. *The way of God*, in the Jewish scholastic sense; emphatically, the practical instruction which came from God Himself and represents His will; the revelation of God as the standard for human conduct. *See* Bretschneider, *sub* ὁδός.

Neither carest Thou for any one.—A cunning temptation to lift Himself, in His proud consciousness, above all respect or care for the Roman authorities. They had indeed found that their power had no effect to intimidate Him in the way of truth. But they might have known that His independence was always connected with the purest submission to the powers that are. Their involuntary acknowledgment shines through their false speech.

Regardest not the person of men.—Πρόσωπον is the outward appearance: the representative of an authority. Οὐ βλέπεις πρόσωπον is essentially the same as Luke's οὐ λαμβάνεις πρόσωπον, ver. 21, but stronger.

Ver. 17. **Is it lawful?**—To the Jew. De Wette: "According to theocratical principles, which regarded Jehovah as the only King in Israel." The theocratical prerogative, however, had not interfered with the representation of Jehovah by human kings in Israel; and the Israelites had paid tribute always to them. In fact, they had in past times paid tribute even to foreign potentates—the Babylonians, Persians, etc. How then, in the face of such precedents, could the question be urged as it was urged on the present occasion? The explanation is to be found in the fact, that the Jewish fanaticism had increased from generation to generation, and that it was now rapidly approaching the point of culmination which it reached at last in the Jewish war. And the hope of the Messiah was also increasing in strength. Thus, while the payment of tribute to a human king might generally be lawful, it was otherwise with a heathen king, especially Cæsar, who threatened to take the place of the Messiah as His dark rival in the rule of the world: this might appear apostasy from the theocracy and the hope of Messiah's kingdom. In this spirit Judas the Gaulonite (Joseph. *Antiq.* xviii. 1; Acts v. 37) had refused the census of the Romans; regarding it as the decisive sign of servitude. And certainly the Jews might have been justified in refusing all political homage to the Cæsar, if the history of the theocracy had not established a distinction between the religious and the political element, and introduced and accustomed them to such a difference between the Church and the State. But fanaticism ignored this distinction as a temporary abuse, and supposed that with the advent of the Messiah it would disappear; meanwhile it was a disorder that must be cunningly submitted to as a necessity. Christ opposes to their temptation the perfect and clear distinction as it was appointed by God. The question: "Is it lawful?" of itself obscures the supposition of duty; and the question: "Must we, as servants of the theocracy, refuse the tribute?" meant, in other words: Must we resist the dominion of the Romans, and rise up in rebellion?

Or not?—The *not lawful* they would fain have put in His mouth.

Ver. 18. **Hypocrites.**—Bengel: "*Jesus verum se eis ostendit ut dixerant, ver.* 16."

Ver. 19. **The tribute-money.**—The coin in which the tribute is paid. *Ubicunque numisma regis alicujus obtinet, illic incolæ regem istum pro domino agnoscunt.* Maimon. *in Gezelah*, v. 18.

Vers. 20, 21. **Whose is this image?**—The Lord's answer gains infinitely in emphasis when we connect it with the action in which He clothes it. Bearing this coin in their hands, they were obliged to appear before Him as the subjects of Cæsar, and themselves read the decision of their own question in the word "Cæsar." But the truth of the answer consists in this, that every one has subjected himself to the actual obligations of a State who has entered into its rights, as symbolized by its currency. Or, he who acknowledges the ruler's right of coining, acknowledges also his right to tribute; he who takes the coin from Cæsar, must give it back to him again. Thus Jesus makes the payment of tribute a duty of virtual obligation. The coin is already Cæsar's. But the word is τὰ Καίσαρος, *the things of Cæsar;* and it includes therefore all the obligations to the State. But this obedience must ever be conditioned by obedience to God, to whom all must pay the trib-

* [The Edinb. trsl. reads here: "For some *remarkable hints, see* Wolf,"—mistaking probably the *sehr sonderbare Deutungen* of the original for *wunderbare Andeutungen.* Mistakes of this kind, whether of carelessness or ignorance of the German language, and all sorts of arbitrary omissions and changes, occur on every page, yea almost in every sentence of this and several preceding chapters, and make the revision a more tedious and disagreeable task than a new translation.—P. S.]

† [A cunning and malignant *captatio benevolentiæ*, as Meyer calls it.—P. S.]

ute of τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ, *the things of God.* And here we must not think merely of any particular tribute—the temple-tribute (the usual interpretation), or repentance (Ebrard)—but of all religious obligations. Erasmus: Give to God that which has the image and inscription of God, the soul (*quod Dei habet inscriptionem et imaginem, i. e., animum*).

Ver. 21. **And unto God the things that are God's.**—The word was not only a precept, but also a correction; since they denied to the Father Himself, in the person of Jesus, the honor due to Him. And so also the word: "Render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's," might have spared them the Jewish war, the destruction of Jerusalem, and the downfall of their nation.

[The answer of our Saviour in ver. 21 is perhaps the wisest answer ever given to any question, certainly the wisest which could possibly be made in this case, and we need not wonder that the enemies who elicited it, "marvelled and left Him." It establishes the rights, regulates the duties, and distinguishes the jurisdiction of the spiritual and temporal powers and their subjects. It contains the fundamental principle and guide for the settlement of the vexed question of Church and State, which has created so much trouble and persecution in the history of Christianity. If men would always strictly adhere to this rule, there never would be a hostile collision between the two powers, which are both of divine origin and authority, the one for the temporal, the other for the eternal welfare of man, and which ought to be kept distinct and independent in their respective spheres without mixture and confusion, and yet without antagonism, but in friendly relation in view of their common origin in God, and their common end and completion in the βασιλεία τῆς δόξης, where God shall be all in all.—P. S.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The temptation of Christ to revolution, through the students and aristocracy of Jerusalem, as the instruments of His enemies.

2. The Messiah Himself divides here the theocracy, which was both Church and State, into Church and State as two distinct parts: He consigns the kingdom of this world to Cæsar, while He limits and conditions it by the kingdom of God.

3. *Render unto Cæsar that which is Cæsar's.*—Here the duty of obedience is deduced from the fact of the existing dominion. Cæsar had the coin, therefore it should be given to him; Cæsar had the power, therefore he should be obeyed. De Wette distinguishes in a futile way between the principles of conscience, of right, and of power and prudence. Prudence is also matter of conscience. To revolt against authority, is contrary to conscience. Political obligations have entered in, as matter of fact, wherever people have settled themselves in the enjoyment of political rights. Hence the passages, Rom. xiii. 1; 1 Tim. ii. 1; 1 Pet. ii. 13, 17, belong here. On the distinction between legitimate and unrighteous dominion, this text says nothing. But it does say that he who has accepted the protection of an actual government, has entered into its political constitution, and acknowledged thereby its rights. The legitimist feeling of devotion to an oppressed power must maintain its propriety by banishment and suffering with it. It can co-exist with the new bond of subjection only as a wish, a sentiment, a longing for deliverance. Enjoying the protection of the existing power, it must submit to the obligations which thence arise. But the antithesis, "Unto God that which is God's," is self-characterized as the higher or absolute principle, which is the condition of the former. Comp. Acts iv. 19 [which contains the right of disobedience to the temporal power, where it clearly contradicts the laws of God.—P. S.].

4. Money represents the palpable earthly side of government and civil relations. He who, in the impress of the coin, is acknowledged as the ruler over the money of the land, is thereby marked out as the ruler of the land. In a certain sense, therefore, the money circulation is a permanent symbol of political subjection and mark of allegiance.* But, over against the external and visible dominion of Cæsar over the civil life, there is the immediate dominion of God over the internal and unseen life. These two dominions are not indeed co-ordinate; the latter is supreme over the former; but it has a pre-eminence which admits of a certain appearance of division between the power of Cæsar and the power of God. But the impress of God is upon the spirit; therefore the life of the soul must be given to God. By the requirement: "Give unto God the things that are God's," Christ certainly, as Gerlach remarks, pointed out to them the way in which they might become really free again; yet not in any such sense as would encourage them to hope for a return of the old theocracy. Obedience to God will make Christendom free from the violence of secular power, and ready for admission into the perfect kingdom of God.

5. The right distinction between that which is God's and that which is Cæsar's, must lead to the true unity of life; while the confusion of these two must lead to division, lie, and hypocrisy. The Jewish hierarchy, in their superstition, made some scruple whether they should pay Cæsar his tribute; and then they threw their own Messiah to him, whose golden fidelity displayed most gloriously the image of God.

6. *Langii opus Bibl.:* We may easily imagine how ashamed these conceited young men must have felt when they departed: wicked as they were they could not but feel that they and their teachers must have nothing but confusion to expect from their encounters with Christ.

7. The peculiar case where the magistrate confounds political and spiritual subjugation, and exerts tyranny over conscience, as Antiochus Epiphanes did and many others, is here not taken into account, inasmuch as the Roman government at the time of Christ tolerated and respected the rights of conscience, and for some time even protected the Christians (though not Christ Himself) against the fanaticism of the Jews.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The temptation of our Lord to pronounce a watchword of rebellion: 1. The cunning attempt of the enemies; 2. the instruments; 3. the issue.—The political temptations of Christians: 1. To refuse tribute (insurrection and rebellion); 2. to sacrifice the conscience

* [Comp. QUESNEL *in loc.*: "The image of princes stamped on their coin denotes that temporal things belong all to their governance; and the image of God imprinted on the soul of man teaches that whatever use he makes either of himself or of the creatures, ought to be referred to God. . . . Princes [Rulers] being more the images of God than other men, ought also to render to God whatever they receive from men, by directing it all to His glory."—P. S.]

(servility).*—Christ supreme victor over all the cunning and all the violence of His enemies.—The counsel of the ungodly, Ps. ii.; their snares, Prov. xxix. 5.—Cunning, the ancient fellow of violence, especially in the government of the hierarchy.—Christ's victory over cunning is the victory of God's kingdom over cunning.—The contest of the Lord with the cunning of His foes tended to the glorification of His wisdom. 1. They take counsel: He is thoroughly prepared. 2. They would entangle Him: He seeks to deliver them out of their own snare. 3. They praise Him in order to His destruction: He rebukes them, in order to arouse and save them. 4. They would fain involve Him in their own wicked designs: He punishes them in His righteousness. 5. They wish to judge Him as guilty: He dismisses them as Judge.—The covenant of the hierarchs and Herodians in order to overwhelm Christ.—The various decisions of Christ touching money.—The salutary distinction of Christ between Church and State.—The decision of Christ upon the rights of Cæsar: 1. They are rights which are derived from God; 2. they are co-ordinate to the spiritual rights of the church; 3. they are subordinate to the rights of God.—The weight of the clause, "And to God that which is God's."—Only he who rightly distinguishes between religious and civil duties will know how to connect them aright.—The hypocritical blending of religion and policy: 1. By withholding the dues to the civil government, under pretext of saving the rights of God; 2. by sacrificing the most sacred rights of God and His church to the secular power.—The enemies of the Lord gather strength from every new humiliation to harden themselves afresh.—The three kinds of assault which His enemies make upon the cause of Christ: 1. With violence; 2. with cunning; 3. with cunning and violence combined.

* [The preceding sentences in the *Homiletical* and the concluding paragraphs of the *Doctrinal* sections, nearly half a column, are omitted entire in the Edinb. trsl., and the Homiletical Hints which follow are either omitted or arbitrarily abridged.—P. S.]

Starke:—*Canstein:* Wicked hearts are only more wicked and malicious by faithful warnings.—The two kinds of serpents, the crooked and the straight (Isa. xxvii. 1; first cunning, then might).—*Zeisius:* When Christ is to be opposed, Herod and Pilate soon become one.—Hypocrites and liars have honey on their lips, and gall in their hearts, Ps. lv. 21.—*Quesnel:* The praise of ungodly men is full of snares.—*Zeisius:* No attack and no cunning of any avail against the Lord.—He who has God's word and truth on his side is sure to carry off the victory.—*Osiander:* He who would put to shame God's servants will himself be put to shame.—The cunning which would entrap wisdom is itself caught.

Lisco:—Christ shows here that it is not His purpose to effect any change in earthly political relations (that is, in a political and earthly way).

Heubner:—The Truth, Christ, stands here in the presence of falsehood.—It is the vocation of the pious to have to move among those who continually pervert their words.—The Christian's bearing toward the various political parties in the world.—What they did in cunning and malice, we should do in earnest sincerity: ask Christ's advice in all cases of doubt and conflict of duties.—The Christian living under a wicked government must submit in all things that do not molest his conscience.—The voice of the gospel on the duties of subjects.—The Christian should recommend his religion by his civil and political honesty.—Christ's dignity in the answer to these questions concerning the duties of subjects and rulers.

Reinhard:—The right of subjects to judge the rule and commands of their governors.—*T. W. Wolf:*—How little the Lord is served by false praise.—*Rambach:*—The most pious Christian is the best citizen.

C. *The Attack of the Sadducees, and the Victory of the Lord.* CH. XXII. 23–33.

(Mark xii. 18–27; Luke xx. 27–40.)

23 The same day came to him the[1] Sadducees, which [who] say that there is no resur-
24 rection, and asked him, Saying, Master, Moses said, If a man die, having no children,
25 his brother shall marry his wife, and raise up seed unto his brother. Now there were
with us seven brethren [brothers]: and the first, when he had married a wife, deceased,
26 and, having no issue,[2] left his wife unto his brother: Likewise the second also, and the
27 third, unto the seventh [unto the seven, ἕως τῶν ἑπτά]. And last of all the woman died
28 also. Therefore in the resurrection, whose wife shall she be of the seven? for they all
29 had her. Jesus answered and said unto them, Ye do err [Ye err, go astray, πλανᾶσθε],
30 not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God. For in the resurrection they neither
31 marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God[3] in heaven. But as
touching [concerning] the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was
32 spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and
the God of Jacob (Ex. iii. 6)? God is not the God[4] of the dead, but of the living.
33 And when the multitude heard *this*, they were astonished at this doctrine.

[1] Ver. 23.—[The article is wanting in Greek and should be omitted in the trsl.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 25.—[Literally: *and the first, having married, died* (or: *married and died*), *and having no seed, left his wife to his brother*, γαμήσας ἐτελεύτησε· καὶ μὴ ἔχων σπέρμα, ἀφῆκε, κ.τ.λ.—P. S.]

[3] Ver. 17.—Τοῦ Θεοῦ is omitted in B., D., etc., according to Meyer on account of Mark xii. 25 [ὡς ἄγγελοι ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς].

[4] Ver. 32.—The second Θεὸς [before νεκρῶν] is stricken out by Lachmann on the authority of B., L., and other ancient MSS. But here, too, Meyer defends it, and explains the omission from the desire of copyists to conform to Mark and Luke. [Omitted in Cod. Sinait.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 23. **Sadducees.**—*See Exeg. Notes* on ch. iii. 7, p. 71, and Winer's article upon them.

Who say (teach).—The οἱ before λέγοντες must not be given up, though wanting in B., D., and other codices. *See* de Wette.

There is no resurrection.—It may be asked, how far and in what sense we are to regard the question of the Sadducees as a temptation; for, doubtless, their question also, like that of the Pharisees, was framed with a view to entangle our Lord in some matter of accusation; and therefore we may assume that their malice was the counterpart of the malice of the Pharisees. It was the last consequence of Pharisaism—which no Pharisee, however, would openly express—that no tribute was to be given to Cæsar, but that his government was to be overturned. Now, this was the position to which they wished Jesus to commit Himself. And so also the Sadducees—though they did not come forward with an outspoken denial of the resurrection—hoped that they would make the Lord appear nothing but a Sadducee, and thereby effectually rob Him of all His influence and authority with the people. Should they not thus get the better of Him before the multitude, it was probable that Jesus would give some interpretation of the passage and of the doctrine which would bring Him into collision with Moses and the law. But they scarcely expected such a solution as Jesus gave; it never entered their thoughts that He would make so clear and definite a distinction between this life and the next. They hoped that they should constrain Him publicly to avow their secret doctrine, even as the Pharisees had hoped that they might make Him declare Himself a consummate Pharisee.

Ver. 24. **Master, Moses said.**—Deut. xxv. 5. They freely quoted the Mosaic law concerning the Levirate marriage. It was ordained, for the preservation of families, that if a man died without male issue, his brother should marry the widow, and that the first-born son should be held in the registers to be the son of the dead brother. (MICHAELIS: *Mosaisches Recht*, ii. p. 98.) On this passage they construct a startling example, which in all probability was purely fictitious and boldly and unscrupulously carried out: their argument taking it for granted that, if there were ever a resurrection, the marriage must needs be renewed in another world. Thus, their design was to show, out of the law itself, that the doctrine of a resurrection was something untenable, and a gross absurdity.

Ver. 26. **Unto the seven.**—That is, unto the seventh.

Ver. 29. **Not knowing the Scriptures,** etc.—There is here a twofold source of knowledge: Holy Scripture, and spiritual experience; or, as the theologian would say, a formal and a material principle. Out of the ignorance of the one source* or the other spring the Sadducee and the Rationalist tendencies to error. It is very observable that our Lord does not confront them with the rebuke, that they did not hold tradition sacred. Pharisaism which stuck to the traditions was no cure for Sadducism. The latter could never be set free from its negations, without learning more profoundly to study and apply its own positive principles, Scripture and the spiritual life. In what sense, then, was it that they did not understand Scripture? In so far as they failed to discern in it its own living substance, its peculiar meaning in reference to the doctrine of immortality. But they understood not **the power of God,** inasmuch as they put no trust in the power of God over death, in His power to raise the dead; and therefore had no ability to conceive of or anticipate the glorification of the present body into a higher state, into a life in which present sexual relations should no longer subsist.

Ver. 30. **In the resurrection.**—Fritzsche: In the resurrection life. Meyer, on the other hand: In the rising. It does not, however, point merely to the moment of the commencement of the new life; but to the state in which that issues, as ἐν τῇ παλιγγενεσίᾳ, ch. xix. 28.—**Nor given in marriage.**—This has reference to the custom of the Jews, that the female members of the family were given in marriage by their father. The resurrection is a higher state of things, in which death is extinguished in the glorification of life, and all things pertaining to marriage and the sexes done away (Luke xx. 36; 1 Cor. xv. 44).

As the angels in heaven.—That is, the angels who are in heaven. Meyer: The risen are not yet in heaven. But compare 2 Cor. v. 1; 1 Thess. iv. 17. With the first resurrection begins the transition of earthly nature into the heavenly; and with the general resurrection earth and heaven will have become one in a glorified heavenly domain. "We find among the Rabbins similar notions of the future relations of the body and of the sexes (*see* Wetstein); but also such a low sensual view as this: *mulier illa, quæ duobus nupsit in hoc mundo, priori restituitur in mundo futuro.* Sohar." Meyer.

Ver. 31. **But concerning the resurrection of the dead.**—Jesus demonstrates the resurrection by the passage, Exod. iii. 6. They drew their argument from the Thorah, from the books of Moses; and He finds His proof in the same.* De Wette: "From this the erroneous conclusion was deduced, even by the Fathers. (Tertull. *de Præsc.* cap. 45; Hieron. *ad loc.*), and by later divines, that the Sadducees accepted only the five books of Moses as canonical (an error which Olshausen seems to retain). Comp. Winer, art. *Sadducäer.*" So also Meyer; but both of them have rather too confidently adopted Winer's

* [The Edinb. trsl. omits *the ignorance of* (*aus dem Nichtwissen der einen Quelle*, etc.), and thus makes the errors of Sadducism and Rationalism actually spring from the Holy Scriptures and spiritual experience!—P. S.]

* [The passage occurs in connection with the appearance of Jehovah to Moses in the burning bush, which was itself a striking symbol of the power of God to preserve what in the course of nature must perish. ALFORD: "Our Lord does not cite the strong testimonies of the Prophets, as Isa. xxvi. 19; Ezek. xxxvii. 1-14; Dan. xii. 2, but says, as in Luke (xx. 37), '*even Moses* has shewn,' etc., leaving those other witnesses to be supplied. The books of Moses were the great and ultimate appeal for all doctrine: and thus the assertion of the Resurrection comes from the very source whence their difficulty had been constructed." Thus the burden of the law, '*I am the Lord thy God*,' contains the seed of immortality and the promise of the resurrection. The law is the hard shell which contains and protects the precious kernel of the gospel.—P. S.]

views.* The remark of Josephus (*Contra Apion.* i. 8), that the whole of the twenty-two books were esteemed divine by the Jews without exception, has no particular weight; for he is speaking only of the Jews generally, and in mass; and it is well known that the Sadducees did not dare to make a *public dogma* of their rejection of the post-Mosaic Scriptures, and of the doctrine of the resurrection. It is plain that the assertion of Josephus cannot be strictly applied to all parties, in view of the relation of the Essenes to the law of sacrifices, and other matters in the Old Testament. (*See* the Pseudo-Clementines.) The passage, quoted by Winer, from Josephus (*Antiq.* xiii. 10, 6), declares that the Sadducees taught: δεῖν ἡγεῖσθαι νόμιμα τὰ γεγραμμένα, that the holy writings must be honored. But these Scriptures were previously defined to be the *laws of Moses* (so Josephus himself says, xviii. 1, 4). At the same time they rejected the tradition of the fathers. Thus they definitely acknowledged only the Mosaic Scriptures, and definitely rejected only tradition. Their position, meanwhile, toward the remainder of the Scripture, was officially an ambiguous one. That *bad antithesis* between Mosaic and non-Mosaic Scriptures, which Josephus adduces, was attributed to them also by the Talmud: *Negarunt legem ore traditam, nec fidem habuerunt nisi ei, quod in lege* (the Thorah) *Scriptum erat.* They certainly did not express any positive rejection of the non-Mosaic Scriptures, because they durst not; but their bad antithesis plainly enough disclosed that they did not acknowledge them, but would be disposed to class them with the traditions, which they did reject. The ancient testimonies, among which that of Origen is prominent, will maintain their force, therefore, in spite of Winer's view.†

Ver. 32. **I am** [not: *I was*] **the God of Abraham.**—This argumentation has been treated by Hase, Strauss, and others, as a specimen of rabbinical dialectics or exegesis. (Comp. contra Ebrard, *Kritik*, etc., p. 606.) But a kind of dialectics which dealt in a merely deceptive demonstration we cannot ascribe to the Lord. The nerve of the argumentation lies in this, that God appears in the passage quoted as a personal God, who bears a personal covenant-relation to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. The thought here expressed is this: *God is the Living, the God of the living* (major premiss); He then calls Himself the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (minor); consequently, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are not simply dead, but they must continue to live as those to whom God is a God. The idea of personality is the root of all arguments for the immortality of the soul and the resurrection of the body. "The similar argument in Menasseh, *f. Isr. de Resurr.* i. 10, 6, appears to have been derived from this passage. Comp. Schöttgen, p. 180." Meyer.

[It is certain that this argument of our Saviour could not have been discovered by any amount of Rabbinical learning and acumen; and yet being once presented to our mind, it strikes us, not as an arbitrary *im*position (like most of the Rabbinical, and many of the patristic allegorical interpretations), but as a real *ex*position of the true meaning of the passage quoted; throwing a flood of light over it, and filling us with wonder at the hidden depths and comforts of the Scriptures. But strictly taken, the argument of Christ avails only for those who stand in *personal covenant relations* with the God of Abraham, and are thus partakers of the Divine life which can never be destroyed, and implies an admonition to the Sadducees to enter into this relation. The immortality and resurrection of the wicked, which is as terrible a doctrine as the resurrection of the just is comfortable, is not denied here, but must be based on other passages of the Scripture.—P. S.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *The Temptation.*—*See* above. The Sadducees hoped that either the Lord would publicly sanction their petty and frivolous denial of the doctrine of the resurrection, or contradict the law of Moses. To this we may add the following consideration:—If the Sadducees *already* knew of the prophecy of Jesus, that He would rise from the dead (and probably Judas had revealed this to them, *see* chap. xxvii. 63), then their temptation would have a special significance: it would be a hint that His hope of the resurrection was delusive enthusiasm, that He might well pause, and, before the determination of the highest authorities should take effect in His death, retreat from His pretensions and His whole work. Caiaphas and many of the Sanhedrin were Sadducees. Probably, therefore, there was here a concealed threatening of death, and a temptation to renounce and retract.

2. "They professed to be those who *knew*,—the illuminated in Israel. But their knowledge was delusion; and a delusion which rested on a twofold ignorance."

3. The Lord speaks, according to Luke, of an attaining unto the resurrection. This is the more precise representation of the resurrection of the glorified, which, however, presupposes the basis of the general resurrection, of which Matthew speaks.

4. He incidentally showed the Sadducees, who opposed the doctrine of angels (Acts xxiii. 8), how little He thought of their rejection of it; for He designedly referred to *the angels in heaven* as persons, whose personal existence in heaven we may confidently assume.

5. The Sadducees had changed the positive law of God into an abstract law of ethics; thus being in a double sense like the Stoics; in their one-sided morality, and in their denial of the personal fundamental elements and relations of life.* The consequence of their system was heathen pantheism. Thus, the question here was not merely the evidence for the resurrection, and that as taken from the law of Moses; a demonstration was to be given which should exhibit the very roots of the doctrine of the resurrection, that is, the doctrine of a personal God, and of His personal bond with human persons, as the foundation of their eter-

* [So has ALFORD *in loc.*: "The Sadducees acknowledged the *prophets also*, and rejected tradition only (*see* this abundantly proved by Winer, *Realwörterbuch*, *Sadducäer*)."—P. S.]

† [In German: *Auffassung*, which the Edinb. trsl. falsely renders *incorrect statements*; thus doing injustice to the late Dr. Winer, who is one of the most conscientious, accurate, and reliable writers in all quotations and statements of facts.—P. S.]

* [It seems to me that the Pharisees rather correspond to the Stoics, the Sadducees to the Sceptics and Epicureans, the Essenes to the Platonists; the first representing the error of orthodoxism and legalism, the second that of rationalism and worldly indifferentism, the third that of mysticism. No doubt many of the Greek and Roman Sceptics and Epicureans, as well as the Sadducees, maintained a respectable show of outward morality and decency.—P. S.]

nal personal life. And in this case also Christ proved Himself the supreme Teacher, by the quotation which He adduced in proof. The astonished people felt the power of His argument.

6. The doctrine of Paul, 1 Cor. xv. (comp. ch. vi. 13), is in obvious harmony with this resurrection-doctrine of the Lord, which exhibits the second life as a state of imperishableness, sublimely elevated above death, and birth, and procreation, and thus above all the state of becoming.

7. We must be on our guard against the common unhistorical parallel drawn between the Sadducees and systems of Epicurean, selfish, sensual, and immoral tendency. They are to be regarded, however, as worldly-minded secularists in a more refined sense, who had fallen into a heathen view and estimation of this world.

[8. The Bible, viewing man in his completeness and integrity as a being consisting of body, soul and spirit, teaches the doctrine of immortality of the soul in inseparable connection with the resurrection of the body, and not in the abstract, unreal and shadowy form of naturalistic and rationalistic theology which would maintain the first and deny the second. Nast: "That the Scriptures attach more importance to the resurrection of the body, than to the mere self-conscious existence of the soul in its disembodied state, arises from the fact that the disembodied state of the soul is considered in the Scriptures as something imperfect, abnormal, so much so that even the souls of the just look forward with intense desire to their reunion with their bodies (Rom. viii. 11, 23). Without the body man has not his whole full life."—P. S.]

[9. Lavater, Stier and Alford justly regard the Lord's answer, ver. 32 (comp. πάντες γὰρ αὐτῷ ζῶσιν in Luke xx. 38), as implying a conclusive argument against the doctrine of psychopanychia, or of the sleep of the soul in the intermediate state between death and the resurrection. The first theological treatise of Calvin was directed against this error, then entertained by the Anabaptists.—P. S.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The Sadducees and Pharisees—the unbelievers and the legalists—leagued against Christ in the temple.—The Sadducees' attack, a perfect type of the style of infidelity: 1. Supposing themselves free, they further tradition; 2. seemingly unprejudiced, they are inwardly bitter; 3. prating about the spirit, they are entangled in sensual notions; 4. pretending to be inquirers, they are only fabling misleaders, doubly ignorant; 5. proud and confident, with nothing but stupidity in art and weapons.—Ignorance the main source of unbelief: 1. Want of scriptural knowledge, or of honest perseverance in seeking it; 2. want of spiritual experience, or at least of sincerity in purpose.—Ignorance in spiritual things the guilt of life.—Christ the great witness of the resurrection.—The roots of that doctrine in the Old Testament.—The bond of believers with the living God a pledge of their resurrection.—The beautiful idea of the future life: 1. Elevated above temporal transitoriness; 2. like the angels of God; 3. a life in heaven.—God not the God of the dead, but of the living.—The life of believers as secure as the life of God, according to the testimony of Christ.—God the eternal pledge of the resurrection.—Our bond with God abolishes death as well as sin.—The absolute and indissoluble connection between the doctrine of immortality and the doctrine of the resurrection: 1. The former requires the latter; 2. the latter presupposes the former.—Have ye not read what is written? Or: There is a reproving and correcting word for every form of unbelief in the Scripture.—Christ the conqueror of unbelief.—Christ the glorifier of this world and the next: 1. He illustrates to us this world by the next, and the next world by this; 2. He brings to perfection this world and the next.—In the controversy between faith and unbelief, the people usually side with faith.

Starke:—When Christ is to be persecuted in His people, those combine together who are not agreed in anything else.—*Canstein:* Satan never ceases to lay snares for Christ and His Church.—*Hedinger:* The mockers are many who deny the resurrection.—*Zeisius:* The ground of all errors and contentions among converted people is their ignorance of Holy Scripture: not so much of its letter, as of the living and blessed apprehension of the mind of the Spirit.—*Canstein:* God's word is not merely what is written there in express letters, but also all that may be deduced therefrom by sound reasoning.—*Quesnel:* God knows how to bring good out of evil, light out of darkness, and the glory of truth out of false doctrine and maliciousness.

Heubner:—Quoting from *Lavater:* "The Sadducees and Pharisees are the two great parties in misleading the human race; they change their position in succeeding ages, one of them ordinarily being pre-eminent. These spirits are always to be contended against, even now: sometimes superstition united with hypocrisy; now unbelief united with the semblance of wisdom and illumination. Against both Christ protests continually; and against both the Church teacher must protest. The former appeal to authority, antiquity, tradition, the sanctity of the letter; the latter, to reason, doubt, freedom."—The same (*Lavater* as quoted by Heubner): "The angel who appeared in the burning bush in the name of God, is a pledge of that which ye deny: he was a symbol that God can preserve what nature seems to destroy."—Christ shows how we must read the Scripture, and use the key for the true knowledge of God.

D. *The Attack of the Pharisees, and the Victory of the Lord.* CH. XXII. 34–46.

(Mark xii. 28–37; Luke xx. 41–44.—*The Gospel for the 18th Sunday after Trinity.*)

34 But when the Pharisees had heard that he had put the Sadducees to silence, they
35 were gathered together [collected in the same place, συνήχθησαν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό]. Then one
of them, *which* [*who*] *was* a lawyer, asked *him a question*, tempting him, and saying,[1]
36 Master, which *is* the great commandment [what kind of commandment is great] in the
37 law?[2] Jesus[3] said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and
38 with all thy soul, and with all thy mind (Deut. vi. 5). This is the first and great [the
39 great and first][4] commandment. And the second [But a second, δευτέρα δέ] *is* like unto
40 it, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself (Lev. xix. 18). On these two commandments hang all the law [hangs the whole law, ὅλος ὁ νόμος κρέμαται] and [also] the
prophets.[5]
41, 42 While the Pharisees were gathered [collected] together, Jesus asked them, Saying,
What think ye of [concerning the, περὶ τοῦ] Christ? whose son is he [of whom is he
43 the son? τίνος υἱός ἐστι;]? They say unto him, *The son*[6] of David. He saith unto
44 them, How then doth David in spirit [by the Spirit][7] call him Lord, saying, The LORD
[in Hebrew: Jehovah] said unto my Lord [Adonai], Sit thou on my right hand, till I
make thine enemies thy footstool [till I put thine enemies under thy feet]?[8] (Ps. cx. 1.)
45, 46 If David then call[9] him Lord, how is he his son? And no man [no one] was able
to answer him a word, neither [nor] durst any *man* from that day forth ask him any
more *questions*.

[1] Ver. 35.—The words: καὶ λέγων (*and saying*), are omitted by Lachmann and Tischendorf [also by Tregelles, but not by Alford] on the authority of B., L., etc. Meyer: An insertion from Mark xii. 28, and contrary to the uniform style of Matthew (ch. xii. 10; xvii. 10, etc.).

[2] Ver. 36.—[Ποία ἐντολὴ μεγάλη ἐν νόμῳ; literally: *What kind of commandment*, or: *What commandment is great in the law?* Meyer: *Was für ein Gebot ist gross im Gesetze?* (*Wie muss ein Gebot beschaffen sein, um ein* GROSSES *Gebot zu sein?*). Ποία is qualitative, *qualis, what kind* (comp. xix. 12), and the article before ἐντολή is omitted. But the Authorized Version agrees better with the answer, and Dr. Lange likewise translates: *Welches ist das grosse Gebot im Gesetz?* The Lat. Vulg.: *Quid est mandatum magnum in lege?* *See Exeg. Notes.*—P. S.]

[3] Ver. 37.—B., L., al., Lachmann, Tischendorf: ὁ δὲ ἔφη.

[4] Ver. 38.—L., Z.: ἡ μεγάλη καὶ πρώτη [for πρώτη καὶ μεγάλη]. Cod. D. likewise, yet without ἡ. So Cod. Z with a second ἡ before πρώτη. The sense of the text is in favor of this reading. The transposition arose from the idea that πρώτη was the principal predicate. [Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Alford unanimously adopt ἡ μεγάλη καὶ πρώτη, which is now sustained also by Cod. Sinait.—P. S.]

[5] Ver. 40.—[The true reading of the best ancient authorities, including Cod. Sinait., recommended by Griesbach, and adopted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Alford, is: ἐν ταύταις ταῖς δυσὶν ἐντολαῖς ὅλος ὁ νόμος κρέμαται καὶ οἱ προφῆται, instead of the *text. rec.*: . . . . ὅλος ὁ νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται κρέμανται. Dr. Lange follows the former in his German Version: *In diesen zweien Geboten hängt das ganze Gesetz und auch die Propheten.* It is also preferable on internal reasons. The lawyer had asked what commandment was great in the *law*; the Saviour answers to this question by naming the great law of love on which hangs the whole law, and the prophets besides.—P. S.]

[6] Ver. 42.—[The interpolation: *The son*, must be omitted, if the question is translated: *Of whom is he the son?*—P. S.]

[7] Ver. 43.—[Ἐν πνεύματι is here not opposed to ἐν νοΐ, but refers to the Holy Spirit as the inspirer of the Scriptures. *See Exeg. Notes.*—P. S.]

[8] Ver. 44.—The *Recepta* reads: ὑποπόδιον (*footstool*), from the Septuagint. But most MSS. and the critical editions: ὑποκάτω (τῶν ποδῶν σου), *under*. [So also Cod. Sinait. As to the sense, Bengel remarks: The warlike kingdom will come to an end; but the peaceful kingdom will have no end, comp. 1 Cor. xv. 25.—P. S.]

[9] Ver. 45.—[Codd. D., K., M., al., insert ἐν πνεύματι, *by the Spirit*, before καλεῖ, and Lange puts it in the text, but in small type. But Lachmann, Tischendorf, Alford reject it as insufficiently supported, and superfluous.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 34–40. *The Question of the Great Commandment, General Remarks.*—Mark gives it in an enlarged form; the narrative of Luke x. 25–37 has a kindred element. De Wette: "Probably the three accounts are different forms of the evangelical tradition, derived from the same historical materials; although there are traces in Luke of some dependence on Matthew." Strauss: "Three free variations of the same primitive Christian tradition." Meyer: "The difference of time and place in Luke's account shows that the accounts of Matthew and Mark only may be considered as variations of the same tradition." We may add, that the occasion and the whole transaction are different in Luke. There, Jesus puts the question: here, the scribe. The account of Mark refers to the same fact, but under a different point of view. Matthew has in his eye the tempting assault which the sect of the Pharisees made upon Christ by one of their agents, without regard to the person of this agent. Mark, on the contrary, has taken pains to describe this latter in full, showing that his spirit was better than that of his party. There is nothing improbable in this; and in Matthew's account also, the rich young man separates himself from the mass of Christ's enemies, as having a nobler disposition than they. Those overpowering influences which Christ exerted upon some individuals in the ranks of the enemy, detaching them from the midst of their party, are among His greatest triumphs, and are anticipations of the power which converted Saul on the way to Damascus.

Ver. 34. **But when the Pharisees had heard.**—What was the motive of the new assault? Strauss: "In order to avenge the Sadducees"—against all probability. The Pharisees were rather rejoiced that Jesus had reduced their enemies to silence; and this Matthew intimates in his ἐφίμωσεν. (Luther: That He had *stopped the mouths* of the Sadducees.) Ebrard: "In order to make evident their superiority to the Sadducees;" which, although Meyer objects, seems very obvious. But they must have had, besides that, another and independent design. Meyer: "They would extort from Jesus an answer to a question of their own which would compromise Him." But what answer? De Wette: "We cannot see the embarrassing nature of their question. The Rabbins distinguished between great and small, weighty and light, commandments (Wetstein on ch. v. 19; xxiii. 23); such a distinction is the basis of all casuistry in morals. Probably, it was very customary at that time; and even if Jesus had declared Himself very freely on the question, it would not have involved Him in any danger." Meyer: "The temptation of the question lay in the Rabbins' distinctions of weighty and light commandments. If Jesus had mentioned any particular ποιότης of a great commandment, His answer would have been measured by the standard of particular distinctions in schools of casuistry; and somehow He would have been compromised." Olshausen understands the πειράζων of an honest desire to search out the views of Jesus.*—Thus exegesis leaves us in the dark here.

But the tempting element of the question is explained by the answer and the counter-question of Jesus. The Pharisees doubtless took it for granted that Jesus would answer them: "Thou shalt love God above all," or: "Thou shalt have no other gods before Me;" certainly He would mention the sanctity of monotheism. But their monotheism was altogether deistical in its bias, and had in it no christological principle. They argued from the unity of God, like Mohammed afterward (compare also the history of Ebionitism and Socinianism), that God could have no son. But they knew that Christ made Himself the Son of God; for this they had charged Him somewhat before (John x.) with blasphemy, asserting that He thereby made Himself equal with God. They intended, therefore, to found upon His expected answer, "to love God above all," a charge of blasphemy, in making Himself equal to that supreme God by pretending to be His Son. But Jesus disturbed this tempting design by adding to the statement of the great and first commandment, "to love God supremely," the declaration that the second was equal to it, "to love our neighbor as ourselves." This elevated the human nature into a higher relation to the Divinity; and He said in effect: "As the second commandment is subordinate to the first, and yet like unto it, so the Son of Man is subordinate to the Father, and yet like unto Him." The Pharisees felt at once that His addition of the love to man had traversed their whole design. But that the argument referred to was really prepared by them, is plain from the question which the Redeemer based upon theirs; that is, the question how David could call the Messiah, his Son (therefore man), his *Lord* (therefore God, or God's Son). The correctness of our exposition is shown also by the following consideration. The two charges under which the council placed Jesus before Pilate's judgment-seat were these: 1. That He had made Himself the Son of God; 2. that He had made Himself king of the Jews in a political sense. This accusation was derived by them, in their embarrassment and affected daring, from that preliminary single but ambiguous charge, that He had made Himself the king of the Jews, that is, the Messiah (*see* the process in John xviii. 19). The *same* ambiguous word: "king of the Jews," they first construed into a religious crime, and then, since that availed nothing, they construed it into a political crime. On this day of temptations, they strove to extract from Him a confession of both these charges. The temptation of making Him a political Messiah had come to nought. They then thought that at least they would involve Him in another, and more perilous condemnation, that of blasphemously impugning monotheism, or undermining the fundamental idea of the Jewish religion: this charge, though not quite so serviceable before Pilate, would serve them better before the people. We are warranted in this supposition by the questioning before Caiaphas, ch. xxvi. 63, and the condemnation to death which ensued upon the answer of Jesus.

They were collected on the same spot.—We may ascribe to a wide diversity of motives the excitement which caused the Pharisees to flock to the spot in masses: delight at the humiliation of the Sadducees; the desire to do better than they had done; despair that all means had failed to extort from Jesus any ground of accusation; among some of them, a nobler complacency in the victory won for the doctrine of the resurrection; probably, also, the wish to induce Him to give up His extravagant pretensions to be the Messiah and the Son of God, and, as an orthodox teacher of the people (in an Ebionite sense), would make Himself useful to them against the Sadducees. Ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό, as in Acts i. 15, referring to place, not sentiment.

Ver. 35. **A lawyer,** νομικός.—A word often used by Luke; by Matthew only here. Paulus understands it, one who acknowledged only the Pentateuch and Scripture, rejecting tradition; that is, a Sadducee (or Scripturist, Karaite;—though these last did not yet exist, they were germinally present in the Sadducees). But this, as de Wette objects, is contradicted by the ἐξ αὐτῶν, which necessarily must be referred to the Pharisees. Meyer: "He was a Mosaic jurist: νομοδιδάσκαλος designates the same as teacher; γραμματεύς is only an enlargement of the idea of νομικός—*one versed* in Scripture, a Biblical scholar, whose calling was the study and exposition of Holy Writ. Comp. Gfrörer in the *Tübinger Zeitschrift* for 1838, i. 146."

Ver. 36. **Which is the great commandment?**—Meyer lays stress* upon the ποία, and explains: How must a commandment be, or what character must it have, in order to be called great? But the answer of Jesus does not suit this. Yet certainly the ποία indicates the quality of the commandment. *The great*, μεγάλη, says more than the greatest. The greatest might be brought into comparison with the less great; but the great must, strictly viewed as a principle, include them all.

Ver. 37. **Thou shalt love the Lord thy God.**—The passage, Deut. vi. 5, freely after the

* [So also Alford *in loc.*, referring to the more detailed account in Mark xii. 28–34. But Nast regards Lange's interpretation as the only intelligible one. It is certainly very ingenious.—P. S.]

* [Not: LESS *stress*, as the Edinb. tral. has it, in direct opposition to the original: *Meyer betont* ποία *und er klärt*, etc. Comp. my critical note above.—P. S.]

Septuagint. Fritzsche: "God as thy Lord." But it would be better to invert it—the Lord as thy God: in the original, *Jehovah thy God*. And this introduces a new significance in relation to Christ. Jehovah, God of the Revelation, the God of the incarnation, was to be Israel's God, and not the God of a deistical perversion.

With all thy heart.—The ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ follows the original Hebrew בְּכָל, and not the Septuagint ἐξ. The **heart** is the entire inner nature of **man**; the **soul** is then rather the vitality of the heart animating the body; the **mind,** its spiritual and intellectual part (*intellectus, mens*). Meyer, following Beck (*Biblische Seelenlehre*, p. 109), makes καρδία the whole energy of the reason and the intellect; ψυχή, the whole energy of sentiment and passion; and διάνοια, the whole energy of thought and will in its manifestation.*

Ver. 39. **But a second is like unto it,** ὁμοία.—This refers to the preceding declaration of Jesus, "The great *and the first*" (according to the true reading). Hence the article may be omitted. The commandment of the love of God is regarded in two lights: 1. As the *great*, which embraces in their unity all commandments, including that of love to our neighbor; 2. as the *first*, inasmuch as it is a special commandment, which precedes the commandment of love to man.—**Is like unto it.**—Compare 1 John iv. 20, 21; Rom. xiii. 9. Even the love of God itself is to manifest and actualize itself by love to man,—more generally by love to all men, more particularly by brotherly love.† The commandment is according to the Septuagint of Lev. xix. 18. Meyer: "ἀγαπήσεις signifies a tender regard, and conduct in harmony with it; this, therefore, may be commanded, but not φιλεῖν, which is the love of affection or sentiment. Compare Tittmann's *Synonyms*." By this answer, Jesus not only penetrated and convicted the wicked design of the Pharisees, but also reproved the error which lurked in their question. He acknowledged a distinction between the great commandment and the rest, so far as the former is the principle, and all others derived from it. But in another sense, He acknowledged no distinction: the derived commandment of love to man is equal to the first in its absolute value, and as representing the first.

[**As thyself.**—"W. Burkitt: Every man may, yea, ought to love himself, not his sinful self, but his natural self, and especially his spiritual self, the new nature in him. This it ought to be his particular care to increase and strengthen. Indeed there is no express command in Scripture for a man to love himself, because the light of nature directs, and the law of nature binds and moves every man so to do. God has put a principle of self-love and of self-preservation into all His creatures, but especially in man. Man ought to love his neighbor, 1. not as he *does* love himself, but as he *ought* to love himself; 2. not in the same degree, but after the same manner, *i. e.*, freely and readily, sincerely and unfeignedly, tenderly and compassionately, constantly and perseveringly."—There are cases, however, where man ought to love his neighbor more than himself, and sacrifice his life for his fellows, his country, and the church, in imitation of the example of Christ and the martyrs. —P. S.]

Ver. 40. **Hangs,** κρέμαται (according to the true reading).—The figure is taken from the door on its hinges, or from the nail on the wall; and aptly indicates dependence upon one common principle, and development from it; and hence it follows that the two great commandments have a higher unity in the one great commandment, that we love Jehovah, the incarnate God of revelation, as our God.—**And also the prophets.**—By the position of οἱ προφῆται after κρέμαται the prophets are made especially prominent. And the sense is this: Even the prophets who predicted the Messiah, the Son of God, do not contradict the great commandment of monotheism; they rather proceed from that law,—that is, from the word of the God of revelation flow the prophetical words concerning His revelation.

Vers. 41–46. *The counter-question of Jesus. Its object.*—Paulus: "Jesus aimed to lead His opponents to the point, that the Psalm was not of David, and not Messianic." (!) De Wette: "He thereby intimated that He was not a political Messiah." Weisse: "He wished to give a hint that He did not spring from David." (?) Meyer: "He thus convicted them of their own ignorance and helplessness concerning the nature of the Messiah." But, connecting the Lord's question with the tempting question that preceded it, it appears plain that Jesus would prove by a Messianic utterance of the Psalm, that the Messiah might be at once the Son of David, *i. e.*, a Son of Man, and at the same time the Lord of David, *i. e.*, the Son of God.*

Ver. 41. **While the Pharisees.**—A significant circumstance. The whole body of Pharisaism is convicted and confuted by an Old Testament word, showing the consistency of the doctrine concerning the Son of God with Scripture.

Ver. 43. **How then doth David by the Spirit call Him Lord?**—Here πῶς is not: "With what propriety, how is it possible?" but: "*In what sense?*" or: "What can he mean by it?"—**Doth call:**—in the sense of formal designation, solemn title.

Ver. 44. **The Lord said unto my Lord.**—Quotation from Ps. cx. There are different views on its authorship and Messianic bearing. De Wette: "The poet (who is not David) calls the king, of whom the Psalm speaks, his Lord. The difficulty is thus taken away by the historical exposition. Jesus assumes the authorship of David, and its Messianic interpretation, simply as being prevalent in His time. But it is not necessary to suppose that Jesus agreed with the common notion. If stress is laid upon the words Δαβὶδ ἐν πνεύματι, it must be remembered that we cannot rely upon the genuineness of these words sufficiently

* [Olshausen: "The Lord by calling the commandment to love God supremely the first and great commandment, does evidently not design to represent it as one out of many, though greater in degree than others. On the contrary, the love of God is *the* commandment, and the whole law, with all its injunctions and prohibitions, is only a development of this one commandment: 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God.' By this love we have to understand the unqualified surrender of our whole being to God. Of such a love man is capable, though not by his own strength, but by Divine grace, because he finds in God alone all his wants fully and everlastingly satisfied."—P. S.]

† [The original reads: *Christusliebe* (Edinb. trsl.: *love of Christ;* or, better: *to* Christ); but this is probably a printing error for *Christenliebe;* for we love Christ not as our neighbor, but as the *God-Man.*—P. S.]

* [Quesnel: "Jesus here asks a question in His turn, not to tempt, but to instruct His disciples; to confound the obstinate; to point out the source of all their captious questions, namely, their ignorance of the prophecies which foretold the Messiah; to furnish His church with weapons against the Jews in all ages; and, by His last public instruction, to establish the truth of His divinity, incarnation, power, and kingdom, as the foundation of all religion."—P. S.]

to build anything upon them. *See* Luke xx. 42." But here it is not Luke, but Matthew who speaks. Meyer agrees with de Wette, but while the latter assumes an accommodation of Jesus to the popular opinion, the former supposes that Jesus shared in the prevailing view as to the historical origin of the Psalm. But in our opinion, the correctness of the application of the word in the Psalm does not depend upon the question, whether David himself composed it or not. That Psalm is manifestly a poetical reproduction of the historical promise of Jehovah, which David received from the lips of the prophet Nathan, according to 2 Sam. vii. 12, and of the last words of David referring to it, 2 Sam. xxiii. 3 sqq. David is introduced as speaking on that basis of what Jehovah had promised the Messiah his offspring.* That the Psalm is Messianic, and in the stricter sense prophetically Messianic, is evident from the tenor of its whole connection. Similarly, in the prophet Daniel we must first distinguish the historical basis and the composition, and then again identify them; since both are combined in the ἐν πνεύματι of Scripture. Compare ch. xxiv. 15.

By the Spirit.—Luke ii. 27; 1 Cor. xii. 3; Rom. viii. 15. Not indeed *impulsu Spiritus;* but in the element of the Spirit, of the Spirit of God, which is the principle of unity in the Scripture.

Him.—The Son of David as the Messiah. The Rabbins saw in this Psalm one of the most clear and decisive Messianic prophecies. It was not till a later period that they retracted this interpretation. *See* Hengstenberg, *Christologie*, on this Psalm [vol. i. p. 140 sqq.].

Ver. 45. **How is He then his Son?**—The answer is Rom. i. 3, 4; Acts ii. 25. It was not the ignorance, but the unbelief, of the Pharisees which declined the answer.

Ver. 46. **And no one could answer Him a word.**—Decisive *mandatum de supersedendo.*—**Nor durst any one from that day question Him any more.**—The great point of severance between the rabbinical, deistic Judaism, and Christian and believing Judaism. Bengel: *Nova dehinc quasi Scena se pandit.*

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

See the preceding remarks. They will, we think, have shown that the question about the great commandment, and the Lord's counter-question concerning David's Son, the Greater than David, have a much higher significance than exegesis has hitherto discerned in them. It is the spiritual process of severance between the deistical apostasy of Judaism, and the true Messianic faith of Judaism—that is, Christianity itself. The silence of the Pharisees, after Christ's question, marks the crisis of their hardening. Hence the decisive and final rebuke of Jesus, and the departure from the temple: symbol of their desolation and judgment.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The last assault of His enemies upon the Lord in the temple.—The last question of the Pharisees, and the last counter-question of the Lord.—The inquiry about the great commandment meant as a temptation of Christ: 1. He will either lay aside His own majesty in presence of the majesty of God; or, 2. asserting His own majesty, He will dishonor the majesty of God.—How the Pharisees misunderstood the great commandment, to love God with all the heart: 1. In opposition to the love of man: 2. in opposition to the dignity of Christ.—The one great commandment in its all-comprehensive significance: 1. It unfolds itself into the gospel, as a prophecy of salvation in the doctrine that the Lord, the incarnate Jehovah, was to be loved as God (the supreme Personality must reveal Himself); 2. it unfolds itself into the law of the Spirit, in the two commandments, the ten, and all other subordinate ones.—To love God with all our life: 1. With all our heart; 2. with all our soul; 3. with all our mind.—The commandment of the love to God a strong testimony for His sacred and mysterious personality,—a witness also of His own glorious love.—Since God is love, love to Him must at once be kindled by the contemplation of Him.—How can the first commandment be the greatest, and yet the second be like unto it? 1. The first is the greatest, because it is the ground of the second, and embraces it; 2. the second is equal to it, because it is the copy of the first, and love to God is to be demonstrated by love to man.—The measure of the love of God: nothing is sufficient, neither our life nor all things.* The measure of love to man: our love to ourselves. —In love to our neighbor we are to prove our love to God.—The two commandments are inseparable: 1. We cannot love God without loving our neighbor (against superstition); we cannot love our neighbor without the love of God (against unbelief).—Self-love has two conditions and guarantees: the love of God, and the love of man.—How far is self-love not commanded, and how far commanded? 1. It is not directly commanded, because it is a natural impulse of life; 2. it is indirectly commanded in the whole law and gospel; since this natural impulse is diseased, and has become selfishness.†—But a second is like unto it; or, how one word of our Lord cuts through the wicked motive and the wicked error of the Pharisees.—How far are the commandments different, and how far alike?—The empire of love is an empire of personal life.—Love is the fulfilling of the law, Rom. xiii. 10.—The counter-question of the Lord; or, the proof of the divinity of Christ from the Old Testament.—As the commandment of love to man is related to the commandment of love to God, so Christ is related to the Father: subordinate, yet equal.—The severance between Christianity and apostate Judaism in the temple.—*They asked no more questions:* no Jew dares ask a Christian any question, or commence an attack upon him; the missionary impulse, to work among the Gentiles, also gradually died away among the Jews since the time of Christ.

Starke:—*Zeisius:* However the wicked hate one another, they unite against Christ, His kingdom and members.—If you would ask, cultivate a sincere heart.—Hypocrites inquire about the greatest commandment, but they do not keep the least.—*Osiander:* As no man is able thus perfectly to love God, no man can be justified by the law.—The question

* [This sentence, so necessary to give Lange's view, is entirely omitted in the Edinb. trsl. For other expositions on the Messianic character of the Psalm, *see* especially Hengstenberg (*Christology of the O. T.*, and his *Com. on the Psalms*), also Stier and Nast *in loc.* Alford and Wordsworth do not touch the difficulty at all.—P. S.]

* [Burkitt *in loc.:* "The measure of loving God, is to love Him without measure."—P. S.]

† [Comp. the practical remarks of Burkitt inserted in the *Exeg. Notes* on ver. 39, p. 404.—P. S.]

concerning Christ the most important and the most necessary.—A correct knowledge of Christ necessary to salvation.—It is not enough to acknowledge Christ as the Son of Man.—Christ is God and Man in one undivided person.

Heubner:—The Rabbins were fond of discussing the relative greatness of commandments. The Jews counted 613 precepts: 365 prohibitions, and 248 commands.—It is dangerous to make a distinction between great and little commandments.—The nature of the love to God which Christianity requires.—*Aristotle:* There is no love to God (connection between this word and the heathen denial of the supreme Personality).—Consult the representations of Fenelon and the earlier mystics concerning the stages of the love to God.—Piety toward God should be kind to man; and the love of men should be religious.—All commandments centre in love.—The whole ethical doctrine of Christianity very simple.—*What think ye of Christ?* always the question which finds out the genuine Christian.—Christ the Lord.—The dominion of Christ a dominion of love.—Faith and love closely connected in Christianity.

Bachmann:—What think ye of Christ? 1. Manifold answers; 2. how important the right one!—*Lisco:* The supreme command, and the supreme article of faith.

[*Quesnel*:—On the great and first commandment, ver. 38: Love is the great and first commandment: 1. In antiquity, being as old as the world and engraven in our nature; 2. in dignity, as directly respecting God; 3. in excellence, being the commandment of the new covenant; 4. in justice, as preferring God above all things, and rendering to Him His due; 5. in sufficiency, in making of itself man holy in this life, and blessed in that which is to come; 6. in fruitfulness, in being the root of all other commandments; 7. in virtue and efficacy; 8. in extent; 9. in necessity; 10. in duration, as continuing for ever in heaven.—*The same*, on ver. 46:—Truth at length triumphs, but the defender of it will notwithstanding be oppressed by men. Hence we should not judge the truth by the sufferings of its defenders. The more triumphant it is, the more they must expect to suffer, that they may be made more conformable to Christ and capable of greater reward.—P. S.]

SEVENTH SECTION.

FINAL JUDGMENT OF CHRIST UPON THE PHARISEES AND SCRIBES. CHRIST OF HIS OWN ACCORD LEAVES THE TEMPLE.

CHAPTER XXIII.–XXIV. 1.

(*Vers.* 34–39, *Scripture Lesson for St. Stephen's Day.*)

1 Then spake Jesus to the multitude [multitudes, τοῖς ὄχλοις], and to his disciples,

A. *The Reproof generally.* **Vers. 2–7. (The law, ver. 3; the inconsistency and falsehood, ver. 3: "*but do not;*" the traditional statutes, ver. 4; the hypocritical sanctimoniousness and unholy ambition, vers. 5–7.)**

2 Saying, The scribes and the Pharisees sit [sat down][1] in Moses' seat [καθέδρα]:
3 All therefore whatsoever they bid you observe,[2] *that* observe and do [do and observe];[3]
4 but do not ye after their works: for they say, and do not. For [But][4] they bind heavy
burdens and grievous to be borne,[5] and lay *them* on men's shoulders; but they *them-*
selves will not move them with one of their fingers [with their finger, τῷ δακτύλῳ αὐτῶν].
5 But all their works they do for to be seen of [by] men: they make broad their phylac-
teries [protectives], and enlarge the borders [fringes, τὰ κράσπεδα] of their garments,[6]
6 And love the uppermost rooms [first place, πρωτοκλισίαν] at feasts, and the chief seats
7 [πρωτοκαθεδρίας] in the synagogues, And [the, τούς] greetings in the markets, and to be
called of men, Rabbi, Rabbi.[7]

Its Application. **Vers. 8–12.**

8 But be not ye called Rabbi: for one is your Master [Leader, καθηγητής; better:
9 Teacher, διδάσκαλος],[8] *even* Christ;[9] and all ye are brethren. And call no *man* your
[**spiritual**] father upon the earth: for one is your Father, which [who] is in heaven [the
10 one in heaven, or, the heavenly, ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς]. Neither [Nor] be ye called mas-
ters [leaders, καθηγηταί]: for one is your Master [Leader], *even* Christ [the Christ, ὁ

11 Χριστός]. But he that is greatest among you [the greater of you, ὁ μείζων ὑμῶν] shall
12 be your servant. And whosoever shall exalt himself shall be abased; and he that shall
humble himself shall be exalted.

B. *The Particular Reproof: the Seven Woes.* **VERS. 13–XXIV. 1. (Avarice and hypocrisy, ver. 13; unbelief and fanaticism, ver. 14; fanatical proselyting, ver. 15; casuistry, vers. 16–22; hypocritical legalism, vers. 23–26; spiritual deadness, vers. 29–32; the judgment, vers. 33–36; Jerusalem's guilt and doom, vers. 37–39; Christ's exodus from the temple, ch. xxiv. 1.)**

13 But woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for [because, ὅτι, as in ver. 29]
ye shut up the kingdom of heaven against men: for ye neither go in *yourselves*, neither
14 [nor] suffer ye them that are entering to go in. Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees,
hypocrites! for [because] ye devour widows' houses, and for a pretence make long
15 prayer: therefore ye shall receive the greater damnation.[10] Woe unto you, scribes and
Pharisees, hypocrites! for [because] ye compass [go about] sea and land to make one
proselyte; and when he is made [becomes so, γένηται], ye make him twofold more the
16 child of hell than yourselves. Woe unto you, *ye* blind guides, which [who] say, Whosoever shall swear by the temple, it is nothing; but whosoever shall swear by the gold
17 of the temple, he is a debtor [ὀφείλει]! *Ye* fools and blind! for whether [which] is
18 greater, the gold, or the temple that sanctifieth the gold? And, Whosoever shall swear
by the altar, it is nothing; but whosoever sweareth [shall swear] by the gift that is
19 upon it, he is guilty [a debtor, ὀφείλει]. *Ye* fools and[11] blind: for whether [which] *is*
20 greater, the gift, or the altar that sanctifieth the gift? Whoso therefore shall swear
[He therefore that sweareth, ὁ οὖν ὀμόσας] by the altar, sweareth by it, and by all
21 things thereon. And whoso shall swear [he that sweareth, ὁ ὀμόσας] by the temple,
22 sweareth by it, and by him that dwelleth [did dwell][12] therein. And he that shall
swear [sweareth, ὁ ὀμόσας] by heaven, sweareth by the throne of God, and by him that
23 sitteth thereon. Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye pay tithe of
[the] mint and anise [the dill] and [the] cummin,[13] and have omitted the weightier
matters [things, τὰ βαρύτερα] of the law, judgment, [and, καί] mercy, and faith:[14]
24 [but][15] these ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone. *Ye* blind
25 guides, which [who] strain at [out][16] a [the] gnat, and swallow a [the] camel. Woe
unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for [because] ye make clean the outside of
the cup and of the platter, but within they are full of extortion [rapacity, ἁρπαγῆς] and
26 excess.[17] *Thou* blind Pharisee, cleanse first that *which is* within [the inside of, τὸ ἐν-
27 τὸς τοῦ] the cup and [the] platter, that the outside of them may be clean also. Woe
unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for [because] ye are like unto whited
sepulchres, which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are within [which outwardly indeed appear beautiful, but within are] full of dead *men's* bones, and of all uncleanness.
28 Even so ye also outwardly appear righteous unto men, but within ye are full of hypo-
29 crisy and iniquity. Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! because ye build
30 the tombs of the prophets, and garnish the sepulchres of the righteous, And say, If we
had been in the days of our fathers, we would not have been partakers with them in
31 the blood of the prophets. Wherefore ye be [are] witnesses unto yourselves, that ye
32 are the children of them which [that] killed the prophets. Fill ye up[18] then the mea-
33 sure of your fathers. *Ye* serpents, *ye* generation [brood] of vipers, how can ye escape
34 the damnation [judgment, κρίσεως] of hell? Wherefore, behold, I send unto you prophets, and wise men, and scribes: and *some* of them ye shall [will] kill and crucify;
and *some* of them shall ye [ye will] scourge in your synagogues, and persecute *them*
35 from city to city: That upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth,
from the blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharias [Zachariah] son of Bara-
36 chias [Barachiah], whom ye slew between the temple and the altar. Verily I say unto
37 you, All these things shall come upon this generation. O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, *thou*
that killest the prophets, and stonest them which [that] are sent unto thee, how often
would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens
38 under *her* wings, and ye would not! Behold, your house is left unto you desolate.[19]
39 For I say unto you, Ye shall not see me henceforth, till ye shall say, Blessed *is* he that
cometh in the name of the Lord.

CH. XXIV. 1 And Jesus went out, and departed from the temple: and his disciples came to *him* for to shew him the buildings of the temple.

[1] Ver. 2.—['Εκάθισαν (aorist), *seated themselves;* Coverdale: *are sat down;* Conant: *have sat down* (with the implication of continuance); Ewald: *liessen sich nieder;* Luther, de Wette, Lange: *sitzen.* The phrase does not necessarily convey blame for usurpation, but states a matter of fact, the act and its result: having seated themselves they sit, and are invested with official authority as teachers and judges.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 3.—Τηρεῖν is omitted by B., D., L., Z., al., [Cod. Sinait.], Lachmann, Tischendorf, etc.

[3] Ver. 3.—Codd. D., L., D.: ποιήσατε καὶ τηρεῖτε, *do and observe.* The reverse order [τηρεῖτε καὶ ποιεῖτε] in the *text. rec.* is explanatory.

[4] Ver. 4.—Δέ is better supported than γάρ [which seems to be substituted as more suitable].

[5] Ver. 4.—Tischendorf omits δυσβάστακτα without sufficient cause. [Lachmann retains it, Alford omits it, so also Cod. Sinait.]

[6] Ver. 5.—*Of their garments,* τῶν ἱματίων αὐτῶν, seems an explanatory addition to the text, but necessary in the translation. [They are wanting in the best authorities, including Cod. Sinait.]

[7] Ver. 7.—[Some of the best authorities, including Cod. Sinait., and the critical editions of Lachmann and Tregelles read: ῥαββί (or ῥαββεί) only once; but Tischendorf and Alford retain the *text. rec.*—P. S.]

[8] Ver. 8.—[Dr. Lange, in his Version (*Meister*), retains with Meyer the *text. rec.:* καθηγητής. But Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, and even Wordsworth, who generally adheres to the received text, read with the best ancient authorities: διδάσκαλος, *teacher,* and this is preferable also on account of ver. 11, to avoid repetition.—P. S.]

[9] Ver. 8.—'Ο Χριστός is an addition from ver. 10, and omitted in the critical editions.

[10] Ver. 14.—[Ver. 14, from οὐαί to κρίμα, is omitted in the oldest MSS., including Cod. Sinait., versions, and citations, and seems to be inserted from Mark xii. 40 and Luke xx. 47. *See* the critical summaries in Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Alford. But Griesbach, Scholz, and Fritzsche, according to Codd. E., F., G., H., etc., assume a transposition of vers. 13 and 14. So also Dr. Lange in his German Version, who regards it as very improbable that Matthew should have omitted such an important feature.—P. S.]

[11] Ver. 19.—Μωροὶ καί is wanting in D., L., Z., [and in Cod. Sinait. which reads simply τυφλοί], omitted by Tischendorf [and Alford], and enclosed in brackets by Lachmann. [The words may have been inserted from ver. 17, where they are genuine.—P. S.]

[12] Ver. 22.—*Text. rec.* (retained by Lachmann on the authority of Cod. B.): κατοικοῦντι, but Tischendorf, with nearly all the uncial MSS., reads: κατοικήσαντι. [So also Tregelles and Alford. The latter suggests that the aorist implies that God did *not then* dwell in the temple, nor had He done so since the Captivity. But in the cleansing of the temple Christ evidently treated it as the house of God, xxi. 13.—P. S.]

[13] Ver. 23.—The definite article before these petty items, as in the Greek (τὸ ἡδύοσμον καὶ τὸ ἄνηθον καὶ τὸ κύμινον) and in the German Versions of Lange and others, should be retained, as it adds emphasis.—P. S.]

[14] Ver. 23.—[Lange translates τὴν κρίσιν καὶ τὸ ἔλεος καὶ τὴν πίστιν: *die* (mosaische) *Rechtspflege und das* (prophetische) *Erbarmen und die* (messianische) *Glaubenstreue. See* his *Exeg. Notes.*—P. S.]

[15] Ver. 23.—After ταῦτα is to be inserted δέ according to Codd. B., C., etc., and the critical editions.

[16] Ver. 24.—[The word *at* before *strain* was originally a printing error for *out,* which first appeared in King James's revision in 1611, and was faithfully copied ever after. All the older English Versions, from Tyndale to the Bishops' Bible (except the N. T. of Rheims, of 1582, which renders: *strain a gnat,* omitting *out*), correctly translate οἱ διϋλίζοντες τὸν κώνωπα: *strain out,* etc. Alford, however, thinks that the phrase in the Authorized Version was no typographical blunder, as is generally supposed, but a deliberate alteration, meaning "strain (out the wine) at (the occurrence of) a gnat." But this is rather far-fetched, and Bishop Lowth is certainly right when he remarks: "The impropriety of the preposition (*at*) has wholly destroyed the meaning of the phrase." The phrase refers to the use of a strainer, and is plain enough with *out.* The Jews carefully strained their wine and other beverages, from fear of violating Lev. xi. 20, 23, 41, 42, as do now the Buddhists in Ceylon and Hindostan.—P. S.]

[17] Ver. 25.—For ἀκρασίας Griesbach and Scholz read ἀδικίας, *unrighteousness.* But B., D., L. speak for the former reading.

[18] Ver. 32.—Πληρώσατε, *implete,* is the correct reading. 'Επληρώσατε (D., H., al.) and πληρώσατε (B., al.) originated in the desire to soften the sense.

[19] Ver. 38.—Codd. B., L., al., and Lachmann omit ἔρημος, but it must be retained as essential.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

THE GREAT DENUNCIATORY DISCOURSE AGAINST THE PHARISEES AND SCRIBES, ADDRESSED TO THE PEOPLE.—This crisis is analogous to that of ch. xv. 10, when Jesus turned away from the Galilean Pharisees, after an annihilating rebuke, and turned toward the people. The provincial example must have its wider consummation in the temple. But the permanent significance of the present crisis is this: *Christ turns from the self-hardening hierarchy, and speaks immediately to the people.* The unity of this discourse has been denied by Schleiermacher, Schulz, Schneckenburger, and others, on the ground of Luke having given some parts of it on a previous occasion in ch. xi. Ewald thinks that the discourse was compounded out of a large variety of original elements. But de Wette and Meyer for good reasons are strenuous supporters of the original unity of the whole discourse. De Wette: "It is very appropriate that Jesus should now first utter Himself so fully and comprehensively against His enemies." Meyer: "The whole composition has a character of such living force and unity, that it is hardly possible to deny its originality and genuineness."* Heubner: "It is not an invective, or utterance of scorn, as many have called it: for instance, Ammon (*Life of Jesus,* iii. 229), who thinks that on that very account it never could have been thus delivered by Jesus." The condemnation naturally included the Sadducees, so far as they were found among the scribes, and belonged to the dominant hierarchy. In themselves, and as a party, they were of no importance; nor were they ever recognised as leaders of the people.

[DR. NAST: "Although the Sadducees were also included among the scribes, yet our Lord in His terrible condemnation singles out the Pharisees, who for the last one hundred and fifty years had enjoyed the highest respect of the people for their zeal and rigid observance of the law. During His whole min-

* [Comp. ALFORD: "There can, I think, be no doubt that this discourse was delivered, as our Evangelist here relates it, all at one time, and in these the last days of our Lord's ministry. . . . It bears many resemblances to the Sermon on the Mount, and may be regarded as the solemn close, as that was the opening, of the Lord's public teaching."—P. S.]

istry He had been making pharisaic formalism the constant object of reproof, while almost ignoring the unbelief of the Sadducees."—It is certainly remarkable that the severest language which Christ ever used, was directed, not against the people, of whom He rather spoke with pity and compassion, nor against the Sadducees, with whom He came less in contact, but against the orthodox, priestly, sanctimonious, hypocritical Pharisees, the leaders of the hierarchy, and rulers of the people. Let ministers and dignitaries in the Church never forget this! Nevertheless the Pharisees with all their wickedness had more moral and religious earnestness and substance, than the Sadducees, and when once thoroughly converted, they made most serious and devoted Christians, as the example of St. Paul abundantly shows. No such convert ever proceeded from the indifferent, worldly, and rationalistic Sadducees.—M. BAUMGARTEN in his *History of Jesus* (as quoted by Dr. Nast *in loc.*) makes the following striking remark on this denunciatory discourse: "As Christ once commenced His Sermon on the Mount in Galilee with pronouncing eight beatitudes, so He closes His last public address with pronouncing eight woes on Mount Moriah, declaring thereby most distinctly that all manifestation of His divine love and meekness had been in vain, and must now give way to stern justice. Of that awful delusion which has done at all times so much harm in the Church—namely, that the office sanctifies the officer, at least before the people—there is here not the most distant trace [not even vers. 2 and 3], but the very opposite. The office held by the scribes and Pharisees Jesus fully recognizes; but the sacredness of the office, instead of furnishing any apology for their corrupt morals, increases only their guilt, and He, therefore, exposes with the utmost severity the wickedness of their lives. Never did any prophet deliver such a discourse as this. We see here turned into wrath the holy love of Jesus, which is unwilling to break the bruised reed or to quench the smoking flax (ch. xii. 19), which seeks and fosters what is lost, which casts out none, but attracts all that show themselves in the least degree susceptible."—This fearful denunciation of the dignitaries and representatives of the Jewish theocracy, which must shake every sensitive reader to the very foundation of his moral nature, could only proceed from one who knew Himself free from sin and clothed with divine authority and power. Having exhausted, in the intensity of His love for sinners, high and low, rich and poor, every effort to bring them to repentance and a better mind, Jesus now speaks, at the close of His earthly ministry and in full view of the approaching crucifixion, with all the dignity and stern severity of a judge, yet without any passion or personal bitterness. This awful severity is as much a proof of His divine mission and character as the sweet tenderness of His invitation to the sinner to come to Him for rest and peace.—P. S.]

Ver. 2. **Sit in Moses' seat.**—The question arises, whether *Moses' seat* means his whole vocation and office, or only a part of it. De Wette: His seat as judge and lawgiver. But Moses as *lawgiver*, or organ of revelation, did not speak from his seat, but from Mount Sinai; and in this capacity he could be succeeded* only by prophets, or conclusively by Christ Himself. The seat of Moses is described Exod. xviii. 13. Moses *sat* in the function of judge and administrator; and in this he might and did allow others to represent himself, who were to judge and rule according to the law of revelation. We have the more formal establishment of the office of elders in Num. xi. 16. The rule of the scribes and Pharisees was the rule of the Sanhedrin. But between the *prophetic* rule of Christ, and the *political* rule of the Romans, there only remained to them the Old Testament ecclesiastical function of explaining the law and administering discipline. Ἐκάθισαν, *they sat down and sit.* "Among the Rabbins, the successor of a Rabbi was called the representative of his school, יוֹשֵׁב עַל־כִּסְאוֹ; Vitringa, *Syn.*" Meyer.

Ver. 3. **All therefore.**—The *therefore*, οὖν, is emphatic, as Meyer correctly urges. It alludes to the established order and office. **All whatsoever.**—Chrysostom and others say that the ceremonial system, and everything false and immoral, were to be excepted; since all this could not have been taught ἀπὸ τῆς Μωϋσέως καθέδρας. De Wette and Meyer: Jesus had in view only the contrast between their teaching and their life; and left the perversion of the office itself, as it existed *in praxi*, out of the question. But their doctrine was corrupt, not only in accidental practice, but in essential principle. We must limit the εἰπεῖν, which is used by Matthew throughout in its full significance, to the *official* utterance. Thus it means: Act according to their words in relation to the theocratic order of the Jewish church, but not in relation to the way of salvation. It was in harmony with the heavenly prudence of Jesus, and with the spirit of all His teaching, that He should express the fullest acknowledgment of the official authority of the Pharisees and scribes, even while He was preparing to unmask and spiritually to annihilate them. He did not on this account impose upon His hearers a permanent subjection to the rule of the scribes and Pharisees. They could, however, be free only in Him and through Him: they must through the law die to the law. He whom the law has slain and excommunicated, is alone free from its claims.*

Ver. 4. **But they bind.**—*See* Luke xi. 46. The binding together of individual things into a mass, has reference here rather to burdens of wood than to burdens of grain. Thus they compact their traditionary statutes into intolerable burdens. A fourfold rebuke: 1. they make religion a burden; 2. an intolerable burden; 3. they lay it upon the shoulder of others; 4. they leave it untouched themselves, *i. e.*, they have no idea of fulfilling these precepts in spirit and in truth. [Alford refers the *heavy burdens*, φορτία βαρέα, not to *human traditions*, as most interpreters do, but to the *severity of the law*, which they do not observe (Rom. ii. 21-23); answering to the βαρύτερα τοῦ νόμου of ver. 23. The irksomeness and unbearableness of these rites did not belong to the Law *in itself* as rightly explained, but were created by the rigor and ritualism of these men who followed the letter and lost the spirit. Similarly Stier and Nast who refer for analogy to

* [The Edinb. trnl. has here: *relaxed*, perhaps a printing error, for *released*, *abgelöst*.]

* [ALFORD: "The οὖν here is very significant,—*because* they sit in Moses' seat,—and this clears the meaning, and shows it to be, 'all things which they, as successors of Moses, out of his law, command you to observe, do;' there being a distinction between their lawful teaching as expounders of the law, and their frivolous traditions superadded thereto, and blamed below."—P. S.]

our modern moralists who preach duty, duty! and nothing else.—P. S.]

Ver. 5. **But all their works.**—Luke xi. 43.—**Their phylacteries,** φυλακτήρια, remembrancers and preservatives.—*Literal* application of the *figurative* expressions of Exod. xiii. 9, 16; Deut. vi. 8, 9; ch. xi. 18. Thence arose the תְּפִלִּין, containing passages of the law upon leaves of parchment—Exod. xiii. 1-16; Deut. vi. 4-9; xi. 13-22—which the Jews at the time of prayer bound, one on the left arm, one on the forehead, to show that the law should be in the heart and in the head. Buxtorf, *Syn.* ch. ix. p. 170; and Rosenmüller, *Morgenland*, v. 82. The term *phylactery* was doubtless formed from the φυλάξασθε τὸν νόμον, Exod. xiii. 10. It is not right, therefore, with de Wette and Meyer, at once to explain them as preservatives or amulets, having magical power. At first, they were simply remembrancers of the law; the heathen notion, that they were personal means of defence against evil spirits, did not arise till afterward. It is probable that the perversion was not perfect at the time of our Lord; otherwise He would have done more than condemn their enlargement of these phylacteries, *i. e.*, hypocrisy and boastfulness in matters of religion. It is probably a result of this rebuke, that at the present day the size of these phylacteries is limited. —The **borders** or **fringes,** κράσπεδα.—Ch. ix. 20; comp. Num. xv. 38. These *zizith* were fastened with blue ribands to the garments (*see* Bæhr: *Symbolik des Mos. Cultus*, vol. i. p. 329.) Blue was the symbolical color of heaven, the color of God, of His covenant, and of faithfulness to that covenant. The tassels themselves signified flowers, or birds; probably pomegranates, and therefore crimson, and not blue, as the ribands were. Thus they were remembrancers that fidelity to the covenant should flourish; or they were tokens that the flower of life was love, and that love must spring from faithfulness to the covenant.

Ver. 6. **The chief seat,** τὴν πρωτοκλισίαν.—"The first place at table; that is, according to Luke xiv. 8 (comp. also Joseph. *Antiq.* xv. 2, 4), the highest place on the divan, as among the Greeks. The Persians and Romans held the middle place to be the seat of honor. The word is not preserved, except among the Synoptists and the Fathers. Suid.: πρωτοκλισία ἡ πρώτη καθέδρα." Meyer.

Ver. 7. **Rabbi, Rabbi.**—The teacher was called by his title, not by his name. "My master, my master,"—the customary repetition of greeting on the part of the scholar among the Jews. רַבִּי was more honorable than רַב, *i. e.*, much, great, *amplissimus*.* Buxt. *Lexic. Talm.* "*Master* (καθηγητής) is more than *Rabbi*. The Rabbi was the teacher in a synagogue. Master was the head of a whole section, a leader who might be followed by many Rabbis (נָשִׂיא, נָגִיד, *rector, princeps*). The proud spirit of the Rabbis has crept into the Christian Church. The Reformers protested against it." Heubner.

Ver. 8. **But ye.**—Vers. 8-12 contain a warning application to the disciples of what had been said. The emphasis is on ὑμεῖς and ὑμῶν, placed first. Properly: *over you one is Master.*

Ver. 9. **Father.**—Father, אָב, the supreme title of a teacher.—**On earth.**—With allusion to the

* [The title was used in three forms: *Rab*, master, doctor; *Rabbi*, my master; *Rabboni*, my great master.—P. S.]

antithesis of the Father in heaven. The *earth* has, however, in the New Testament a symbolical meaning also in opposition to the sea, the fluctuating world of the nations (*see* Rev. xiii. 11, comp. ver. 1; John iii. 12, 31; Matt. xvi. 19), as being the cultured world, the civil and ecclesiastical order.

Ver. 10. **Master,** better: **Leader,** in the spiritual sense,—καθηγητής, not to be confounded with κατηχητής. The third denomination has a special importance among the three: the first points mainly to the Jewish, the second to the Romish, hierarchy. No one should seek the distinction of being the founder of a church or sect.

[Albert Barnes, in his *Notes*, understands the prohibition of titles by our Saviour literally, and hence opposes (and personally always rejected) the title "*Doctor of Divinity*," the Christian equivalent of the Jewish *Rabbi*, as contrary to the command of Christ, to the simplicity of the gospel, and the equality of ministers, and as tending to engender pride and a sense of superiority. But to be consistent, the title *Reverend*, *Mr.* and *Mrs.*, etc., should likewise be abolished, and the universal *thou* of the Quakers and Tunkers be introduced. And yet Paul called himself the (spiritual) father of the Corinthians, 1 Cor. iv. 15, and Timothy his *son* in the faith, 1 Tim. i. 2, and Titus likewise, Tit. i. 4; Peter uses the same term of Mark (probably the evangelist), 1 Pet. v. 13. It is plain, therefore, that the Saviour prohibits not so much the titles themselves, as the spirit of pride and ambition which covets and abuses them, the *haughty* spirit which would domineer over inferiors, and also the *servile* spirit which would basely cringe to superiors. In the same way Christ does not forbid in ver. 6 to occupy the first seats, for some one must be uppermost (as Matthew Henry remarks)—but to seek and love them. Alford: "To understand and follow such commands in the slavery of the letter, is to fall into the Pharisaism against which our Lord is uttering the caution."—P. S.]

Vers. 9-12.—Comp. ch. xviii. 1; xx. 20; Luke xiv. 11; xviii. 14. Meyer: "These prohibitions of Jesus refer to the hierarchical spirit which practically attached to the titles named at that period. Titles of teachers cannot be dispensed with, any more than the class of teachers; but the hierarchy, as it was re-introduced in the Romish Church, is quite contrary to the spirit and will of Christ. Well observes Calvin on ver. 11: "*Hac clausula ostendit, se non sophistice litigasse de* VOCIBUS, *sed* REM *potius spectasse.*" * We must mark the distinction: Ye shall call no man *father*, and shall not be called by any, *master*, nor *leader* (πατήρ, ῥαββί, or διδάσκαλος, and καθηγητής). The worst corruption is the calling any man *father;* that is, to honor in any man an absolute spiritual authority. This religious homage is a contradiction to the absolute authority of the Father in heaven. Grotius; "*Deus dogmatum auctor. Jer.* xxxi. 34; *Isa.* liv. 13; *John* vi. 45, ἔσονται πάντες διδακτοὶ Θεοῦ; 1 *Thess.* iv. 9, θεοδίδακτοι. *Sed alio sensu patres recte vocantur, qui nos in Christo per Evangelium genuerunt*, 1 *Cor.* iv. 15."—The title of *Rabbi* referred to a constrained honor, which took away the brotherly equality of the faithful; or, in other words, the stamping of human

* [Comp. the remark of Alford on ver. 11: "It may serve to show us how little the letter of a precept has to do with its true observance, if we reflect that he who of all the Heads of sects has most notably violated this whole command, and caused others to do so, calls himself '*servus servorum Dei.*'"—P. S.]

scholastic teaching with the dignity of law. That both these errors touched too closely the authority of Christ, is asserted in the third exhortation: They should not be called spiritual *guides*, *founders*, etc., because One only had that dignity, Christ. *See* 1 Cor. i. 12. It can scarcely be denied that the designation of an ecclesiastical community by the name of a man, is inconsistent with this express prohibition, although much depends upon the origin of the name and the spirit with which it is used. Names of reproach have frequently become names of honor in the history of the church. The expression, ὁδηγός, ver. 16 and ch. xv. 14, Rom. ii. 19, 20, is not quite so strong as καθηγητής.

[Alford, following a hint of Olshausen (*Christus der einige Meister*), refers the three titles to the three persons of the Holy Trinity, viz., πατήρ, ver. 9 to God the Father, διδάσκαλος, ver. 8 (according to the true reading, instead of the καθηγητής of the *text. rec.*, *see* my *Crit. Note* 8, p. 408) to the Holy Spirit (comp. John xiv. 26; Jer. xxxi. 33, 34; Ezek. xxxvi. 26, 27), not named here, because his promise was only given in private to the *disciples*, and καθηγητής to Christ. "If this be so, we have God, in His Trinity, here declared to us as the only One, in all these relations, on whom they can rest or depend. They are all brethren, all substantially equal—none by office or precedence nearer to God than another; none standing between his brother and God." Nast adopts this interpretation, which he thinks throws a flood of light upon the passage. But it is rather far-fetched, and the position of the *Teacher* (the Holy Spirit) between the *Father* and the *Leader*, instead of being mentioned last, is decidedly against it.—P. S.]

Ver. 13. **Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees.**—There are seven woes according to general reckoning: the first, therefore, might seem superfluous; and this recommends, again, the omission of ver. 13, which is also critically contested. But, if we compare this discourse with the seven beatitudes of the Sermon on the Mount, we observe that the eighth woe is a summary of the seven in a concrete form, just as is the case with the eighth and ninth beatitudes. There, the concrete unity of all the benedictions is the being persecuted for righteousness' sake, for Christ's sake, as the prophets were persecuted in old time. But here, the eighth woe has the same force with respect to the Pharisees, who adorned the graves of the prophets, and yet showed that they themselves were no better than murderers of the prophets. This, therefore, leads to the supposition of a sustained antithesis between the benedictions and the woes:—

1. Poverty in spirit.	—Devouring widows' houses, and for a pretence making long prayers (being spiritually rich).
2. The mourners.	—The kingdom of heaven shut against others, while they go not in themselves. Fanaticism as opposed to repentance.
3. The meek.	—Zeal of proselytism.
4. Hungering and thirsting after righteousness.	—Casuistical morality, which corrupts the doctrine of sin, and raises the human above the divine. Swearing by the gold of the temple, by the offering.
5. The merciful.	—Tithing mint and anise; and leaving out righteousness, *mercy*, and faith.
6 The pure in heart.	—Cleansing the outside of the platter, the inside being full of uncleanness and covetousness.
7. The children of peace (messengers of life).	—Sepulchres, full of hypocrisy and *lawlessness*.

Summary of the Seven.

Persecuted for righteousness' sake, as the prophets were persecuted.	—Murderers of the prophets.
Persecuted for Christ's sake.	—The ninth woe is wanting, and this is very significant. Instead of it, we hear the lamentation of Christ over Jerusalem. (*See* the *Doctrinal Thoughts* below.)

Ver. 14. **Ye devour.**—We put ver. 14 before ver. 13 (*see* the different readings). It is to be remarked that our Lord here establishes precisely the same connection between the worldly care and covetousness of the Pharisees, and their hypocritical formality, as in ch. vi. 1, 19; but in that passage the order is inverted, as the Lord there proceeds from the hypocrisy to its root—worldliness of mind and covetousness. The ὅτι gives the reason; *because.*—**Devour widows' houses**, *i. e.*, to obtain them unrighteously. This was damnable in itself, but much more when it was done under the cloak of piety, or καὶ προφάσει. The καί is not "mechanically brought from Mark." It marks an advancement in the guilt. The περισσότερον κρίμα we refer, as a prolonged sentence, to the lengthened hypocritical prayers which went before. "At a very early date this avarice in securing legacies crept into the Christian Church; and therefore Justinian passed ordinances forbidding the clergy to inherit possessions." Heubner.

Ver. 13. **Ye shut up.**—The kingdom of heaven, appearing with Christ, is represented as a palace, or, more precisely, a wedding-hall, with open doors. The hypocrites shut the kingdom of heaven *before* the people, ἔμπροσθεν.—**For ye neither go in yourselves.**—The shutting up is therefore twofold: 1. by their own guilt and wicked example; 2. by the actual keeping back of those who are entering, who not only would go in, but have their feet already on the threshold. So was it with Israel. The people were on the point of believing, when their hierarchical authorities drew them back into unbelief.

Ver. 15. **Ye compass sea and land.**—Fanatical proselytism. DANZ: *De cura Hebræorum in conquirendis proselytis in Meuschenii N. T. ex Talm. illust.* p. 649. That the Pharisees undertook actual missionary journeys, cannot be inferred with certainty from Joseph. *Antiq.* xx. 2, 4 (not 3 and not 1); for this passage speaks of a Jewish merchant who made proselytes, and the remnant of the Ten Tribes were very abundant in Adiabene. But we may suppose that there were such missions, and, indeed, that a proselyting impulse generally drove the Jews through the world. The real Pharisee did not make proselytes from heathenism to Judaism merely, but also from Judaism to Pharisaism.—**The child of hell.**—One who is doomed to perish or at least in great danger.—**Twofold more than yourselves.**—Διπλότερον, according to Valla, must be taken as an adjective, and not, as is customary, adverbially. But how was the proselyte worse than the Pharisee? Olshausen: Because the proselytes were without the spiritual substratum of the Mosaic economy, which was an advantage the Pharisees still possessed. That is, the latter were Jews and Pharisees, while the proselytes were only a caricature of

Pharisaism. De Wette: Error and superstition are doubled by communication. Meyer: Experience proves that proselytes become worse and more extreme than their teachers. Thus the proselyte is a Pharisee of a higher degree. We might point to the Idumeans as examples, who converted John Hyrcanus (not till afterward a Sadducee) by force in their ξηρά—"τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ τὴν ξηράν"—or Petra. The house of Herod afforded a striking illustration of the character of such proselytes, in whom the dark elements of heathenism were blended with the dark elements of Judaism. The proselyte Poppœa probably urged Nero to the persecution of the Christians. But that the misleader is generally worse than the misled, is a fact which does not here come into view; it is a wicked conversion or perversion that is spoken of, and the intensification of Pharisaism with the course of time. De Wette rightly observes, that Jesus does not here mean the endeavor to convert the Gentiles to Judaism generally. Meanwhile Judaism as Judaism was not called to the work of heathen missions except in the way of mere preparation. The law can only make proselytes; the gospel alone can convert. *See* Heubner on Proselytes and Proselytizing, p. 346. Cardinal Dubois, under the regency in France, *convertisseur en chef.* Several Jewish proselytes of modern times.*

Ver. 16. **Woe unto you, ye blind guides!**—*Casuistry* as the lax perversion of the fundamental laws of religion and morality. The mark common to both the examples given is this, that the divine institution, imposing holy obligation, is counted for nothing; and that, on the other hand, the human work which requires sanctification through the divine is placed in its stead. "The Pharisees distinguished oaths, in respect to their validity, according to external, superficial [or rather fundamentally wrong] notes, only in the interest of unscrupulousness." De Wette.—**By the temple.**—The oath is very frequent, *by this dwelling*, המעון הזה. (Wetstein and Lightfoot).—**By the gold of the temple.**—By its golden adornments and vessels of gold; or by the temple-treasure. Jerome and Maldonatus are in favor of the latter. When we distinguish between the essential house of God, and the house of God as ceremonially adorned with gold, then Pharisaism swears only and always by the gold of the temple: it cannot swear by the temple itself. The outer manifestation is to it the reality itself: that is, for example, a church "with naked walls" is no church. "Meanwhile it is probable that the pharisaic and hierarchical covetousness preferred the oath by the treasure of the temple, as that by the sacrifice." De Wette.—**It is nothing.**—It has no significance, and imposes no obligation (the Italian *peccadiglio*): the *reservatio mentalis* of Jesuitical morality.—**He is a debtor.**—Bound to observe the oath.

Ver. 17. **For which is greater?**—Superiority of the originally holy, the divine, to that which is derivatively holy, the human, which is made holy only by the divine. The same relation which the gold bears to the divine house, the human offering bears to the divine fire which makes the altar an altar.

Ver. 18. **Whoso shall swear by the altar.**—To any living view of the altar, the offering is one with the altar. Casuistry cuts asunder the living relations of religion, kills its life, denies its spirit, and idolizes its body.

Ver. 21. **And whoso shall swear by the temple.**—We expect to hear, "he sweareth also by the gold of the temple." But this is self-understood; and therefore Christ returns back to the Lord of the temple, who makes the temple what it is, and makes heaven, the great temple, what it is. The oath has its significance generally in this, and in this only, that it is a confirmation by God, a declaration uttered as before God.

Ver. 22. **And he that shall swear by heaven.**—Meyer: "The contrary of ver. 22 is found in *Schevuoth*, f. 35, 2: *Quia præter Deum, cœli et terra creatorem, datur etiam ipsum cœlum et terra, indubium esse debet, quod is, qui per cœlum et terram jurat, non per eum jurat, qui illa creavit, sed per illas ipsas creaturas.*"

Ver. 23. **For ye pay tithe.**—The ordinances concerning tithes (Lev. xxvii. 30; Num. xviii. 21; Deut. xii. 6; xiv. 22–28) placed the fruits of the field and of the trees under the obligation; but tradition applied the law to the smallest produce of the garden, to the mint, the dill, and the cummin (Babyl. Joma, f. 83, 2. Lightfoot, HOTTINGER: *De decimis Judæor.*)—**The weightier things:** βαρύτερα.—De Wette: Those things which were harder, *difficiliora*. Meyer: The more important, *graviora*. "It is very probable that Jesus referred to the analogy of the *præcepta gravia* (חמורים) *et levia* (קלים) among the Jewish teachers. (*See* Schöttgen, p. 183.)" But there is no need to distinguish things so closely connected: the important supposes the difficult. Pharisaism is led into legalism and ceremonialism by its aversion to the difficult requirements of internal spiritual religion.—**Judgment,** κρίσις, מִשְׁפָּט.—*See* Isa. i. 17. Thus, not righteousness itself, but fidelity in the discharge of duties according to the principles of righteousness. The mark of this care for right is, that it is one with **mercy**; and this mercy cannot be replaced by a hypocritical appearance, the almsgiving of the Pharisees (Matt. vi. 1).—**Faith,** τὴν πίστιν.—Luther, "faith;" de Wette and Meyer, "fidelity," as in Rom. iii. 3; Gal. v. 22. The opposite is ἀπιστία. Scriptural language does not distinguish between the two ideas, as ours does. Faith and fidelity are one in the principle of trust. But here ethical, subjective faith, or fidelity, is meant. Christ marks the moral development of the law in three stages: 1. The faithfulness of the Mosaic position: rigid care of law and right (Elijah). 2. The prophetic position: mercy to sinners, and even to the heathen, as the internal principle of legality. 3. Messianic fidelity as the fulfilment of the whole law. True fidelity is identical with this fidelity. Heubner: "κρίσις, conscientiousness; πίστις, sincerity. "It presupposes a blunted moral feeling to show much concern about little faults, but to care nothing for great ones. (Luther, *Works*, x. 1986, applies the same passage to the papal laws.)"

These ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone.—Reverse order. True and internal adherence to law places the great matter first, without being lax in the less.

Ver. 24. **Blind guides,** comp. ver. 16.—The term implies that they not only acted as hypocrites, but also taught as hypocrites. Ver. 16 pronounces a separate woe against all casuistry. But here the words, and what follows them, explain the woe of

* [Comp. here some excellent remarks quoted from an English periodical, the *Homilist*, in NAST's Commentary, p. 590, on the great difference between the genuine missionary and the proselyting spirit, the godly zeal, and the sectarian zeal.—P. S.]

ver. 23 rather in its dogmatic side. The appellations, "*Ye fools and blind*," vers. 17 and 19, represent them as self-blinded and in voluntary delusion.

Strain out* a gnat.—Ye strain (the wine) in order to separate off the gnats. The *liquare vinum* had among the Greeks and Romans only a social significance; but to the Pharisees it was a religious act. It was supposed that the swallowing of the gnat would defile them; and therefore the Jews strained the wine, in order to avoid drinking an unclean animal. (Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* Wetstein, from *Chollin*, fol. 67, *culices pusillos, quos percolant.*) The actual custom is here a symbol of the highest Levitical scrupulosity; and the opposite, the *swallowing of camels*, which of course could only signify the most enormous impurities in the enjoyment of life and its earthly pleasures, was the symbol of unbounded and unreflectingly stupid eagerness in sin. The expression is of a proverbial type. The camel was in the law unclean, because it had no divided hoof, Lev. xi. 4; and, moreover, this hypothetical swallowing of the camel would involve a thorough violation of the Noachic prohibition of eating blood and things strangled.

Ver. 25. **The outside of the platter.**—Figurative description of the legal appearance of gratification. *Cup* and *platter:* meat and drink, or the enjoyment of life in all its forms.—**But within.**—Here we have the internal and moral side of gratification.—**They are full of extortion and excess.**—"That of which they are full, wine and food, was the produce of robbery and incontinence (ἀκρασία, a later form of ἀκράτεια)." Meyer. *See* Isa. xxviii. 7 sqq.

Ver. 26. **Thou blind Pharisee, cleanse first.**—The rebuking adjective *blind* points here also to the absurdity of their practice.—*Cleanse* the inside. Sanctify thy enjoyment by righteousness and temperance.—**That the outside may be clean.**—Fritzsche: May be able to be cleansed. Meyer, better: That the purity of the externals may follow. "External purity is not here declared useless (de Wette); but it is declared not to be true holiness, which implies the preceding purification of the inner man." It is here presupposed that all their adorning of the outside must fail to make even that clean, so long as the inside is full of defilement: that is, Levitical purity without moral purity is itself defilement. (Bengel, in a gentler expression, *non est munditiea.*)

Ver. 27. **Whited sepulchres.**—"The graves were every year, on the 15th Adar, whitened with a kind of chalk (κονία)—a practice derived by the Rabbins from Ezek. xxxix. 15; not merely for the sake of appearance, but also that these places, the touch of which was defilement (Num. xix. 16), might be more easily seen and avoided. (*See* the rabbinical passages in Lightfoot, Schöttgen, and Wetstein.) Thus they always had a pleasant outward appearance." Meyer. But thus also they were adorned. Luke xi. 44 is a similar thought, not, however, the same.

Full of dead men's bones.—Dead bodies were unclean according to the law, and the touch of them defiled (Num. v. 2; vi. 6): this was specially the case with the bones of the dead and the odor of decay from the grave. Impurity has a deadly effect. Spiritual death exerts a deadly influence (1 John iii. 14, 15); and thus what follows, the murder of the prophets, is introduced.

Ver. 28. **Hypocrisy** is here the wicked disguise; and **iniquity,** ἀνομία, is not simply immorality, but consummate theocratical lawlessness.

Ver. 29. **Ye build the tombs of the prophets.**—Construction of sepulchral graves, stones, and monuments, with various designs and inscriptions on consecrated burial ground. The antithesis is delicate: **And garnish the sepulchres of the righteous** (canonized saints). The latter are acknowledged at once, and receive their monuments; the prophets, on the other hand, often lay long in unknown and even dishonored graves. Later generations then began to become enthusiastic about them, and make their common graves elaborate monuments. "The custom of building monuments to ancient and celebrated persons, has existed among all peoples and in all ages. Comp. Wetstein, Lightfoot, Jahn, *Arch.* i. 2." De Wette. Consult Robinson's *Researches* on the remarkable sepulchres around Jerusalem, and the so-called sepulchres of the prophets.

Ver. 30. **And say.**—First of all, by the fact of adorning their sepulchres.—**If we had been in the days of our fathers.** Not: *if we were* (Meyer), which here gives no sense.—**Of our fathers.**—Primarily, by *natural* lineage, but also in the sense of fellowship: *Sons* of the murderers, in a spiritual sense; which de Wette, without any reason, opposes.

Ver. 31. **Ye be witnesses unto yourselves.**—How this? De Wette: By virtue of the guilt transmitted to you. Meyer: "When ye thus speak of your fathers, ye give testimony against yourselves, that ye belong to the kin of the murderers of the prophets." But the meaning is rather, the opposite of this: Since ye repute the fathers, in spite of their murderous spirit against the prophets, as being in the fullest sense of the word, in your traditions, your fathers; and explain the ancient blood-guiltiness, which has been transmitted to you, only as accidental evils into which they fell, or as the product of a barbarous age. Just as in these days the horrors of the inquisition are excused on account of the barbarism of the Middle Ages, although they had their essential root in the fanaticism of the principle of tradition. The continued acknowledgment of those old false principles, from which those murders sprang, establishes the community of guilt, and the propagation of the old guilt to consummate judgment. Heubner quotes: "*Sit licet divus, dummodo non vivus.*"*

Ver. 32. **Fill ye up then the measure.**—Chrysostom says that this πληρώσατε was spoken pro-

* [Not: *at*, which is in all probability originally a typographical error for *out*. *See* the critical note above, No. 16, p. 408. Another striking example of the tenacity of a typographical blunder which found its way into many editions of the English Bible, is *vinegar* for *vineyard* in Matt. xx. 1. Hence the term: *The Vinegar-Bible.*—P. S.]

* [Dr. CROSBY, *Explanatory Notes or Scholia in loc.*, in view of the parallel passage in Luke xi. 47, where the word *for* makes a connection between building the tombs and approving their fathers' crimes, suggests the conjecture that there was a proverb among the Jews asserting complicity in crime, like "One kills him, and another digs his grave." STIER and ALFORD: The burden of this hypocrisy is, that they, being one with their fathers, treading in their steps, but vainly disavowing their deeds, were, by the very act of building the sepulchres of the prophets, joined with their fathers' wickedness. *See* Luke xi. 47, 48. Instead of the penitent confession: "We have sinned, we and our fathers," this last and worst generation in vain protests against their participation in their fathers' guilt, which they are meanwhile developing to the utmost and filling up its measure.—The Pharisees called the murderers of the prophets rightly their fathers: they are even worse than their fathers, because they add hypocrisy to impiety.—P. S.]

phetically; Grotius, permissively. De Wette and Meyer make it an ironical imperative. De Wette: "The πληρώσατε presupposes the ability and willingness in the mind of the Pharisees which merely needs encouragement." (!) The difficult analogon of this difficult passage is the word of Jesus to Judas, John xiii. 27: "What thou intendest to do, do quickly." The last means to scare the wicked from their gradually ripening iniquity is the challenge: Do what ye purpose at once! If this is irony, it is divine irony, as in Ps. xxi. 4.*—**Fill ye up.**—The ancient crime of the prophet-murdering spirit ran on continuously through the ages. (*See* Isa. vi.; Matt. xiii. 14; Acts xxviii. 26.) Its consummation was the murder of Christ.—Fill up then, **even ye,**—καὶ ὑμεῖς. The emphasis, however, falls upon the πληρώσατε. Ye, who condemn the murderers of the prophets, will *even* fulfil the measure of their guilt.—The *measure* of guilt. The expression was, according to Wetstein, current among the Rabbins. With the full measure of guilt, judgment begins. The passage, Exod. xx. 5, which de Wette quotes, describes the generic nature of guilt in the reduced sphere of a single house; and the guilt of a community, of a church, of an order, is to be distinguished as an enlarged measure of the more limited family guilt.

Ver. 33. **Serpents.**—Comp. Luke iii. 7. Πῶς φύγητε. The *Conj. delib.* supposes the matter to be inwardly decided. **The judgment of hell,** ἀπὸ τῆς κρίσεως τῆς γεέννης). The sentence which condemns to hell. The expression, *judicium Gehennæ* was used by the Rabbins (Wetstein).

Ver. 34. **Wherefore I send,** etc.—Fearful teleology of judgment. The messengers of salvation must hasten the process of doom for the hardened. Sin, which will not be remedied, must be drawn out into its full manifestation, that it may find its doom and destruction in the judgment.—**Behold, I send unto you.**—This is difficult, inasmuch as Jesus seems to bring down into the present, as His own sending, the sending of the prophets who had appeared in earlier times. (1) Van Hengel: The quotation of an old prediction. (2) Olshausen refers to Luke xi. 49, Jesus speaking here as the essential Wisdom. (3) De Wette: Jesus utters this with the feeling of His Messianic dignity; these prophets and wise men are His own messengers, the Apostles, etc. But here it is not merely the New Testament martyrdoms that are meant; the whole history of the persecutions of the prophets appears teleologically, *i. e.*, as judgment. Hence Jesus speaks out of the central consciousness of the theocratical wisdom, and in unison with the consciousness of the Father: comp. Matt. xi. 19. As the last who was sent of God, He was the moving, actuating principle of all the divine missions: comp. John i. 26. But as the Old Testament times were not excluded, so the New Testament times are included.† The futures are prophetic, as is the whole passage. Hence in the σταυρώσετε Jesus thought assuredly of Himself. Meyer refers to the crucifixion of Simeon, bishop of Jerusalem and Pella: Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* iii. 22.—The expression καὶ ἐξ αὐτῶν is very strong. They will be no better than brands for the fire of your fanaticism.

Ver. 35. **That upon you may come.**—The common expression for judgment, Eph. v. 6, as intimating its inevitableness, suddenness, power, and grandeur. — **The righteous (innocent) blood,** דָּם נָקִי; that is, the punishment for it, comp. ch. xxvii. 25, but such as the righteous blood has awakened. Innocent blood appears as the leader of avenging powers: comp. Gen. iv. 10; Heb. xii. 24; Rev. vi. 10. Certainly the blood of Christ speaketh better things than the blood of Abel; but that blood has also its condemning character, and indeed in the shedding of that blood the judgment of the world was completed. *The righteous blood* is here emphatic: the consecrated, sanctified blood of the prophets. Bengel: "αἷμα, *ter hoc dicitur uno hoc versu magna vi.*" Ἐκχυνόμενον, in the present tense. The blood is a continuous stream, which still flows and will flow, being present especially in its spiritual influence. Rev. vi. 10.

Zachariah, son of Barachiah.—*See* 2 Chron. xxiv. 20. Zachariah, the son of the high-priest Jehoiada, stoned in the court of the temple by command of the king. There are difficulties here: 1. He was not the last of the martyrs of the Old Testament: the murder of Urijah, Jer. xxvi. 23, was of a later date. But besides the order of the Hebrew canon, there was something pre-eminently wicked in the destruction of the former. Zachariah was the son of a high-priest of the greatest merit; he was murdered between the temple and the altar, and died crying, The Lord seeth, and will avenge it. And, moreover, his destruction was always vividly in the remembrance of the Jews. *See* Lightfoot on this passage, and Targum Thren. ii. 20. 2. The father of Zachariah was Jehoiada, here called Barachiah. Different explanations: (*a*) Beza, Grotius, al.: his father had two names; (*b*) van Hengel, Ebrard: Barachias was the father, Jehoiada the grandfather; (*c*) Kuinoel supposes that the words, "son of Barachiah," are a gloss; (*d*) de Wette, Bleeck, Meyer [and Alford] decide that an error in the name has crept in. "Probably Jesus Himself did not mention the name of the father (Luke xi. 51), and it was added from an original tradition: the error being the result of confounding the person of Zachariah with the better known Zechariah *the prophet*, whose father was named Barachiah (Zech. i. 1). This tradition was followed by Matthew; but in the Gospel of the Hebrews the error was not found (according to Jerome, the name there was Jehoiada)." Meyer. (*e*) According to Hammond and Hug, the Zachariah meant was the son of Baruch, who was killed in the temple after the death of Christ (Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* iv. 6, 4). Hug thinks that Jesus spoke in the future, but that the Evangelist, after the event had taken place, put it in the preterite. But this is an untenable notion, even apart from the difference between Baruch and Barachiah. Ammon, who also refers the words to the Zachariah of Josephus, explained them as interpolation. (*f*) Chrysostom quoted an ancient opinion, according to which it was the last but one of the lesser prophets, Zechariah. (*g*) Origen, Basil, and others, thought it was Zacharias, the father of John the Baptist—following a mere legend; to which the objection holds good, that if Jesus had come down to such recent times, he would doubtless have mentioned John the Baptist Himself. The Lord moreover speaks not of the blood-guiltiness of the present generation, but of the guilt of former times, which came upon the present generation because they filled up the iniquities of their fathers. (Comp. art. in "*Studien und Kritiken*" for 1841, p. 20, and *Pharmaci*

* [Ps. xxi. contains no trace of irony, and there must be some error here in the reference of Dr. Lange.—P. S.]

† [The Edinb. trsl. has here again just the reverse: "the New Testament times *were not* included." Lange says: "*So wenig die alttestamentliche Zeit ausgeschlossen ist,* so WENIG *die neutestamentliche.*"—P. S.]

des, περὶ Ζαχαρίου υἱοῦ Βαραχίου. Athens, 1838.) We prefer the solution *sub* (*b*). But if there was an error of name (*see* (*d*)), we might ascribe it, with Ammon and Eichhorn, to the translator of St. Matthew rather than the primitive evangelical tradition, as de Wette and Meyer do. It is very difficult to determine whether Matthew, in his familiarity with the genealogies, had a more correct account than that of the Book of Chronicles, or whether his translator made the change. It is in favor of the second supposition of Jehoiada being the grandfather, that he died at the age of 130, and that Zechariah, who is called his son, was laid hold on by the Spirit at a later time, and appeared as a prophet.*

Ver. 37. **Jerusalem, Jerusalem** (Luke xiii. 34, where it is placed earlier for pragmatic reasons).—Language of the more mighty emotion of compassion after the stern language of judgment. But with the change of feeling there is also a change of subject, and of the exhibition of the guilt. In the place of the Pharisees and scribes, it is Jerusalem; that is, the centre of the hierarchy, but also of the people, and this name combines the poor misled and the blind misleaders,—the present, also, and the past. In the place of the punishment of ancient blood-guiltiness spoken of before, Jerusalem's own personal guilt is denounced now as justifying this condemnation. — **Thou that killest.** — The expressions ἀποκτείνουσα and λιθοβολοῦσα are emphatic in two ways: first, through the participial form, and, secondly, through the present tense, —the habitual murderess of the prophets, the stoner of the messengers of God.—**How often would I have gathered!**—The Lord still speaks out of the theocratic and prophetical consciousness which embraces in one the Old and New Testaments; yet the "*how often*" presupposes a frequent operation of the Lord's grace in Jerusalem, and visits which the Evangelist was acquainted with, but which did not fall within his plan. Comp. here the Gospel of John. —**Thy children.**—That is, thy inhabitants. But, in a wider sense, all Israelites were children of Jerusalem.—**As a hen.** — Allusion to the destruction which impended over Jerusalem, in a figure which signifies that He would have taken Jerusalem under the protection of His Messianic glory, if it had turned to Him in time. The figure of the hen was often used by the Rabbins concerning the Shechinah, as gathering the proselytes under the shadow of its wings.—**But ye would not.**—The one guilt of Jerusalem was unfolded in the guilt of her individual children. Jesus knew that with the obduracy of the authorities the obduracy of the city and its inhabitants was decided. Hence He used the preterite, not the present tense. Jerusalem's children had made their choice. The crucifixion of Jesus and the fall of the city were decided. It is quite an independent question, how many of the individual inhabitants of Jerusalem were saved by apostolical preaching. Historical notices on the later deplorable condition of Jerusalem, *see* in Heubner's Com. p. 349.*

Ver. 38. **Behold, your house.**—No longer, "My Father's house." According to Grotius, Meyer, etc., *the city;* according to de Wette and others, *temple and city.* But the only true interpretation is that of Theophylact, Calvin, Ewald, *the temple.* For the word marks the moment at which Jesus *leaves the temple,* and leaves it for a sign that it was abandoned by the Spirit of the theocracy. Indeed, the leaving of the temple intimated that not merely the city, but also the land, was forsaken of the Spirit; for the temple is referred to in its symbolical meaning. We retain the addition "**desolate,**" *i. e.*, a spiritual ruin. It was omitted in some copies, probably because it was thought that the word would open up some prospect of a restoration of the temple. But the prospect of the restoration of Israel involves only the spiritual rebuilding of Israel's temple in the Spirit of Christ.

Ver. 39. **For I say unto you.**—Most solemn declaration.—**Ye shall not see Me henceforth:**—In My Messianic work and operation. From that, as among the Jews, He now entirely withdrew. *See* John xii. 37 sq. After the resurrection, He showed Himself only to His own people. — **Till ye shall say.**—Neither at the destruction of Jerusalem (Wetstein), nor at the advent of Christ (Meyer), but in the future general conversion of Israel (Rom. xi.; Zech. xii. 10; Isa. lxvi. 20, etc.).—**Blessed be He that cometh,** Ps. cxviii.—*See* the notes on the entry into Jerusalem, Matt. xxi. 9, 10. Jerusalem itself had not met the Redeemer with these words of greeting, but had asked, *Who is this* (xxi. 10)? Thus it is an intimation of a future conversion. Not tragic and judicial, as Meyer explains it.

XXIV. Ver. 1. **And Jesus went out.**—It is not merely a local and temporary departure from the temple that is meant. It is true that He had overcome all the assaults of His enemies in the temple; but still they had declined to give Him their faith, and at length had declined it by their absolute silence. And as the Lord of the temple, the temple had rejected Him, in the person of those who had legal authority in it. That was the fall of the temple; and it was then decided that it was no more now than a den of robbers, in which all—the Messiah, and the Spirit, and the hope of the Gentiles, and the blessing of Israel—was as it were murdered. He takes farewell of the temple; and from that time forward it became no better than a hall of desolation, a dreary and forsaken ruin. According to a Jewish legend in Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* vi. 5, 3, the guardian angels of the temple deserted it at a much later period. "At the Pentecost, when the priests for the night went into the temple to perform the divine service, they heard a great and rushing sound, and then the cry, μεταβαίνωμεν ἐντεῦθεν.—Tacitus, *Hist.* v. 13: *Expressa repente delubri fores et audita major humana vox. Excedere deos; simul ingens motus excedentium.* In the fortieth year before the destruction of Jerusalem, the lamp in the temple was extinguished of itself, according to Jewish accounts (*see*

* [Wordsworth in an elaborate note assigns a mystic reason for the use of the patronymic, viz., it refers to Christ Himself as the true Zachariah = Remembrancer of God (from זָכַר, *recordatus fuit*, and יָהּ, *Jehovah*), and the true Son of Barachiah, *i. e.*, the Son of the Blessed (from בָּרַךְ, *benedixit*, and יָהּ), who had been typified by all the martyrs of the Old Testament from Abel to Zachariah, the son of Jehoiada. And he sees in εὐλογημένος—κυρίου, ver. 39, an allusion to the name Βαραχίας in ver. 35. But he omits the circumstance that Zechariah *the prophet* was the son of Barachiah, Zech. i. 1.—P. S.]

* [The words: οὐκ ἠθελήσατε, *ye would not*, are important for the doctrine of the freedom and responsibility of man which must not be sacrificed to, but combined with, the opposite, though by no means contradictory doctrine of the absolute sovereignty and eternal decrees of God. ALFORD *in loc.*: "The tears of our Lord over the perverseness of Jerusalem are witnesses of the freedom of man's will to resist the grace of God."—P. S.]

Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* ad Matt. xxvi. 3). The synagogue is still a place void of God, because it knows not Christ." Heubner. Indeed, this departure of Christ was not absolutely the last; for, after the resurrection, He solicited His enemies there, in the person of His Apostles. For the last time He left it when Paul was condemned in it (Acts xxi. 33; xxii. 22), and James the son of Alphæus was slain (Joseph. *Antiq.* xx. 9, 1).

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *See* the preceding *Exegetical Notes.*

2. The seven benedictions of the Sermon on the Mount were summed up in an eighth: Blessed are all who are persecuted for righteousness' sake. And this benediction has here its counterpart in a comprehensive woe, the eighth, upon the murderers of the prophets. But the ninth benediction, "Blessed are ye, if ye be scorned and persecuted for My sake," has no counterpart among the woes, but the cry of distress over Jerusalem. True, that the Jews themselves afterward cried: "His blood be on us and on our children" (ch. xxvii. 25); but Jesus Himself knew that His "blood would speak better things than the blood of Abel." Hence the change of the ninth woe into the lament over Jerusalem.

3. The guilt of the scribes and Pharisees became now, to the Lord's view, the guilt of Jerusalem, and then the guilt of the nation itself. For Jerusalem was the representative of the spirit of the Pharisees and of the national genius. But Jerusalem represents also* the life and the honor, the fathers and the glory, the youth and the hope of the nation. Jerusalem represents the children of the nation, so often threatened by tempests of ruin, and now threatened by the saddest of all. Therefore the Lord mourns and laments over His own ruined Jerusalem. All the missions and messages of God which had been sent to Jerusalem, and which formed the ground of Israel's judgment, to Him appeared now rather as so many efforts and impulses of God to save them. His own compassionate desire to save them had been active throughout all those ages of divine mission; but especially had it been active during the time of His own labors and ministry. His whole pilgrimage on earth was troubled by distress for Jerusalem, like the hen who sees the eagle threatening in the sky, and anxiously seeks to gather her chickens together under her wings. With such distress, Jesus saw the Roman eagles approach for judgment upon the children of Jerusalem, and sought with the strongest solicitations of love to save them. But in vain! They were like dead children to the voice of maternal love!

4. Stier, ii. 527: "Jehovah represented His dealing with His people, first, as that of an eagle, hovering over her young and bearing them on her wings (Deut. xxxii. 11); but at last, as that of a hen which strives to extend her wings over her imperilled chickens." Antithesis between the fidelity of ruling power, and the fidelity of suffering mercy.

5. *Behold, your house.*—Words which were sealed even by the vain attempt of Julian to build the temple again, as well as by its whole subsequent fate. Comp. RAUSCHENBUSCH (sen.): *Leben Jesu*, p. 327.

6. *Till ye shall say, Blessed.*—SEPP, *Life of Christ*, iii. 31: The Jewish rulers failed in this greeting in the day of the Palm-entry, and the people owe it to Christ to this day. This word contains, however, a definite promise of the national restoration of Israel, as it is set forth in Rom. xi., and in many passages of the prophets. *See* ALFRED MEYER: *der Jude*, Frankfort, 1856; where, however, there is too much intermingling of Jewish Christian expectations.

7. Jesus, after departing from the temple, still remained quietly in the court of the women, and blessed the widow's gift: thereby blessing true and simple piety, in the midst of debased and degraded ceremonialism. Comp. Mark xii. 41; Luke xxi. 1; and the author's *Leben Jesu*, ii. 3, p. 1249.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

1. *The Preface* (vers. 1–3) *and the Discourse as a whole.*—The preaching of the truth must, according to the repeated example of the Lord, turn from priests and teachers who persistently scorn it, to the common people.—The great condemnation pronounced by Jesus in the temple upon the Pharisees and the scribes.—The Lord vindicates and protects appointed ordinances, even while vehemently condemning those who administered them.—High esteem for the office never excludes free condemnation of the abuses of those who hold it.—Hypocrites condemn their own works by their own words.

2. *The General Rebuke* (vers. 4–7).—Dead traditionalism: 1. Its hardness; 2. its falsehood; 3. its selfishness.—Despotism in holy apparel and in the domain of the conscience: 1. Doubly fearful; 2. doubly ruinous; 3. doubly impotent.—The Lord holds up to His disciples the image of spiritual ambition and pride for an everlasting warning.—The power of faith disposes of the pretensions of spiritual ambition: faith in the only Teacher: faith in God as the only Father; faith in Christ as the only Lord and Guide. (Thus the Apostle's Creed, rightly understood, is threefold Protestant.)—Out of the humility of fidelity springs the courage of freedom.

3. *Specific Rebuke: the seven woes* (vers. 13–37).—The seven benedictions and the seven woes.—The eighth woe as the summary of the seven: like the eighth benediction.—The ninth woe is changed into a lamentation over Jerusalem.—*First woe:* Spiritual avarice and greediness for securing legacies; petitioners changed into beggars.—The long prayers of the hypocrites, and the long sentence of judgment.—*Second woe:* Those who shut the kingdom of heaven to others, and exclude themselves. *Third woe:* Proselytism; soul-winners and soul-ruiners.*—*Fourth woe:* The work of man up, the work of God down: the inward nothing, the outward everything.—The true oath always by the living and true God.—The blindest ignorance connected with a conceit of keenest insight into the laws of the kingdom of God.—*Fifth woe:* Legality in little things; lawlessness in great. Straining out gnats; swallowing camels.—*Sixth woe:* The outside and the inside of the cup and the platter; or, the feast of the religious and moral hypocrite: 1. In the outward form, consecrated or adorned; 2. in the inner character, abominable and

* [The Edinb. Version reads: "Jerusalem was the *sole* representative;" mistaking the German *allein* (= *aber, but*) before (not after) Jerusalem (*Allein Jerusalem repräsentirt auch*), and thus destroying the necessary antithesis to the preceding sentence.—P. S.]

* [In German: *Seelenwerber und Seelenverderber.*—P. S.]

reprobate.—*Seventh woe:* The whited sepulchres: 1. Like pleasant abodes outwardly; 2. caves of bones, diffusing death, within.—Spiritual death, in the guise of spiritual bloom: 1. Captivating; 2. destructive.—*The eighth woe:* The murderers of the prophets.—How the garnishing the sepulchres of the prophets may be suspicious: 1. When it bears witness to a diseased hanging on to antiquity [false and morbid mediævalism.—P. S.]; 2. when it robs the prophets of the present of their rights.—To persecute Christ in His saints is to persecute Christ Himself.—He who would free himself from the blood-guiltiness of olden times, must free himself from the principles which created it then.—Ancient guilt finds its sure consummation in terrible judgment, however long delayed.—The sinner's inherited guilt becomes his own only through his own personal guilt.—*Jerusalem, Jerusalem!—How often.*

4. *The Departure from the Temple.*—The temple desecrated by obduracy: 1. A house of men, forsaken of God; 2. a house of desolation, forsaken of the Spirit; 3. a house of misery and death, forsaken of Christ.—The golden sunset after the evening storm; or, the prospect of the restoration of Israel.—The departure of Christ from the temple of the Jews: 1. The close of a mournful past; 2. the sign of a miserable present; 3. the token of a sad futurity.—The last word of the Lord to His people, the announcement of His first royal advent to punish His people (in the destruction of Jerusalem).

Starke:—All hypocrites are severe toward others, but very indulgent toward themselves.—*Canstein:* A faithful teacher uses severity toward himself, but he rules those who are under him with gentleness.—By thy words wilt thou be condemned.—They would fain have men believe that there was a special sanctity in the habit of their order.—*Canstein:* Pharisaic folly; elegant Bibles and books of prayer, and no devotion in the heart.—One is our Master, Christ.—*Quesnel:* God's word and truth is an inheritance common to all the brethren. He who would glory in being its lord, and keep his brethren from the use of it, is a robber of the Church's inheritance.—The Church of Christ is a family, of which God alone is the Father.—[*Quesnel* on ver. 1: Let us always look with respect on Christ and His authority, even in the most imperfect of His ministers. The truth loses nothing of its value by the bad lives of its ministers. The faith is not built upon the lives of pastors, but upon the visible authority of the Church (? rather upon Christ and His word).—P. S.]—*Hedinger:* Let no man vaunt himself of his position and office.—The gifts by which we are useful to others are from Christ, and they are the gifts of grace.—Humility is the true way to abiding dignity.—Hypocrites would convert others, while they are themselves unconverted; hence their converts generally go from worse to worse.—It is not God, but gold, not the altar, but what is on it, that they are concerned with.—Swearing by the name of the great God, is, indeed, a matter of tremendous importance.—Sins reproduce one another; when one has wasted what he has robbed, he robs again that he may waste.—The unconverted man is like a sepulchre, in which man lies in his corruption.—*Quesnel:* Many are Christians in name and appearance; few in spirit and in truth.—*Canstein:* At last the whited mask drops off, and the hypocrite is naked and discovered.—Garnishing the graves of the old martyrs, and making new martyrs.—When men in their wickedness receive no more exhortation, but make a mock of God and His servants, the measure of wrath is very near being filled up.—*Wherefore I send unto you.* Rom. ii. 4: The goodness and long forbearance of God.—God remembers all the blood-guiltiness of the history of mankind: woe to them who become partakers of the guilt!—*Verily I say unto you.* God's threatenings are not in sport.—*Jerusalem, Jerusalem:* the fatherly heart of God is earnest in calling men to salvation.—The cause of ruin is the evil will of man.—*Osiander:* Contempt of God's word is followed by the downfall of all rule, authority, and good institutions, Dan. ix. 6, 11, 12.—*Canstein:* There is a time of grace; there is also a day of judgment.

Gerlach:—Ver. 6. Notwithstanding these solemn prohibitions, how much of these sins have been found in all churches and sects, from the highest to the least!—Ver. 16 sq. These rules of the Pharisees about swearing were doubtless designed, first, to relax the strict obligation of certain oaths of common life; and then to enrich the temple-treasure, by attributing a greater sanctity and more rigid obligation to the gold which was ordained for the temple, and the sacrifices which were ordained for the altar, and which were partly the perquisite of the priests. Comp. ch. xv. 5; Mark vii. 11.—Ver. 36. Every sinner who, in spite of the divine warnings, walks in the footsteps of his fathers, draws down upon his own head the punishment which was in their times mercifully deferred and suspended.

Lisco:—The condemnation of Jesus affects all who are contented with *appearing* that which they should *be.*—The woe is upon their deceiving of souls; their hypocritical covetousness; their hypocritical proselyting; their hypocritical trafficking with oaths; their hypocritical pedantry; their hypocritical righteousness; their hypocritical respect for the saints of God.

Heubner:—The dignity of the ministry is to be honored for its own sake.—The ordinances of men always a burden; the commandments of God and of Christ are always a gentle yoke.—Spiritual pride and ambition always one of the chief temptations and dangers of ministers.—Christ does not forbid the title, but the ambition for it. Application to the Romish Church, and the name *Papa universalis. Pater.*—Not ruling, but serving, makes greatness.—Great difference between zeal for conversion and ambition for conversion [or missionary spirit and selfish proselyting.—P. S.].—Hypocrisy in vows, *reservatio mentalis.*—Ask whether anything impure clings to your enjoyment: the tears and sighs of the poor.—It is a base reverence for the great of olden time, which will not seek to imitate them.—Every generation should be improved by the preceding; if not, it is made worse.—The great design of Jesus is *to gather* in poor, wandering, and scattered children of men into one family of God.—*Desolate.* Every Christian temple, in which Christ is not preached, is empty; so is every heart in which He does not live.

PART FIFTH.

FINAL and Fullest Manifestation of Christ as the Prophet; or, Discourses of the Lord concerning the "Last Things" (Eschatological Discourses).

(Matt. xxiv. 2–xxv. 31; Mark xiii.; Luke xxi. 5–38. Comp. the Apocalypse of John.)

According to the Gospel of Mark, ch. xiii. 1 sq., it is to be assumed that Jesus, after His departure from the temple on the evening of His contest with the Pharisees, that is, on the evening of Tuesday in the Passion-week, went out to Bethany. Further, that He paused on the brow of the Mount of Olives, looked back upon the city and the temple, and explained to the three confidential disciples, Peter, James, and John—Andrew being on this occasion added to them—*the full significance of His solemn departure from the temple;* revealing to them the signs of the approaching destruction of Jerusalem and of the end of the world, as also the signs of His own glorious coming. In harmony with apocalyptical style, He exhibited the judgments of His coming in a series of cycles, each of which depicts the whole futurity, but in such a manner that with every new cycle the scene seems to approximate to, and more closely resemble, the final catastrophe. Thus, the first cycle delineates the whole course of the world down to the end, in its general characteristics (vers. 4–14). The second gives the signs of the approaching destruction of Jerusalem, and paints this destruction itself as a sign and a commencement of the judgment of the world, which from that day onward proceeds in silent and suppressed days of judgment down to the last (vers. 15–28). The third describes the sudden end of the world, and the judgment which ensues (vers. 29–44). Then follows a series of parables and similitudes, in which the Lord paints the judgment itself, which unfolds itself in an organic succession of several acts. In the last act Christ reveals his universal judicial majesty. Ch. xxiv. 45–51 exhibits the judgment upon the servants of Christ, or the clergy. Ch. xxv. 1–13 (the wise and foolish virgins) exhibits the judgment upon the Church, or the people. Then follows the judgment upon individual members of the Church (vers. 14–30). Finally, vers. 31–46 introduce the universal judgment of the world. The relation of all these sections to each other will be shown in the *Exegetical Notes.* All these eschatological discourses must have been delivered at all events as early as Tuesday evening, and upon the Mount of Olives. Ch. xxvi. 2, "Ye know that after two days will be the Passover," might seem to imply that this word also was spoken on the Tuesday, and consequently all the parables and discourses of ch. xxiv. and xxv.; although "after two days" might have been said on Wednesday, since the part of the current day was commonly included; and, on the whole, it is more probable that on the day after His withdrawal from the temple and the people, on Wednesday (*see* Luke xxi. 37, 38; John xii. 37–50), He completed these parables on the last things.

FIRST SECTION.

THE GENERAL JUDGMENT; OR, THE END OF JERUSALEM AND THE END OF THE WORLD.

CHAPTER XXIV. 2–44.

(Pericopes: 1. Ch. xxiv. 15–28, *on the 15th Sunday after Trinity;* 2. Ch. xxiv. 37–51, *on the 27th Sunday after Trinity.*—Parallels: Mark xiii. 1–37; Luke xxi. 5–36.)

Occasion of the Discourses. VERS. 1–3.

1 And Jesus went out, and departed from the temple: and his disciples came to him
2 for to shew him the buildings of the temple. And Jesus [he answering][1] said unto

them, See ye not[2] all these things? verily I say unto you, There shall not be left here
3 one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down. And as he sat upon [on]
the mount of Olives, the disciples came unto him privately [κατ' ἰδίαν], saying, Tell us,
when shall these things be? and what *shall be* the sign of thy coming, and of the end
of the world [the present order of things, αἰῶνος, not: κόσμου]?

Signs, and the Manifestation of the End of the World in general. VERS. 4–14.

4 And Jesus answered and said unto them, Take heed that no man [lest any one,
5 μήτις] deceive you. For many shall come in my name, saying, I am [the, ὁ] Christ;
6 and shall deceive many. And ye shall hear of wars and rumours of wars: see that ye
be not troubled [beware, be not troubled]:[3] for all[4] *these things* must come to pass, but
7 the end is not yet. For nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom:
8 and there shall be famines, and pestilences,[5] and earthquakes, in divers places. All
9 these [But all these, πάντα δὲ ταῦτα] *are* the beginning of sorrows. Then shall they
deliver you up to be afflicted, and shall kill you: and ye shall be hated of [by, ὑπό] all
10 nations for my name's sake. And then shall many be offended, and shall betray one
11 another, and shall hate one another. And many false prophets shall rise, and shall de-
12 ceive many. And because iniquity [wickedness, lawlessness, ἀνομία] shall abound, the
13 love of many [the many, the great mass, τῶν πολλῶν] shall wax [become] cold. But
he that shall endure [endureth, ὁ δὲ ὑπομείνας] unto the end, the same shall be saved.
14 And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the [inhabited] world [οἰκου-
μένῃ] for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come.

Signs of the End of the World in particular.—(a) The Destruction of Jerusalem. VERS. 15–22.

15 When ye therefore shall see the abomination of desolation [τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώ-
σεως],[6] spoken of by Daniel the prophet (ix. 27), stand [standing, ἑστός][7] in the holy
16 place, (whoso readeth, let him understand,) [let the reader think of it!][8] Then let
17 them which be [that are] in Judea flee into [to] the mountains [Peræa]: Let him which
18 [that] is on the housetop not come down to take any thing out of his house:[9] Neither
19 let him which [that] is in the field return back to take his clothes [garment].[10] And
[But, δέ] woe unto them that are with child, and to them that give suck in those days!
20 But pray ye that your flight be not in the winter [in winter, χειμῶνος], neither [nor] on
21 the sabbath day [on a sabbath, ἐν σαββάτῳ]: For then shall be great tribulation, such
as was not [has not been] since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever[11]
22 shall be. And except [unless] those days should be [were] shortened, there should no
flesh be [no flesh would be] saved: but for the elect's sake[12] those days shall be short-
ened.

(b) Interval of Partial and Suppressed Judgment. VERS. 23–28.

23 Then [i. e., in the time intervening between the destruction of Jerusalem and the end of the world]
if any man shall say unto you, Lo, here *is* [the, ὁ] Christ, or there; believe *it* not.
24 For there shall arise false Christs, and false prophets, and shall shew great signs and
wonders; insomuch that, if *it were* possible, they shall [so as, if possible, to][13] deceive
25 the very elect [even the elect, καὶ τοὺς ἐκλεκτούς]. Behold, I have told you before.
26 Wherefore if they shall say unto you, Behold, he is in the desert; go not forth: be-
27 hold, *he is* in the secret chambers; believe *it* not. For as the lightning cometh out of
the east [forth from the east, ἐξέρχεται ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν], and shineth even unto the west;
28 so shall also [so shall be][14] the coming of the Son of man be. For[15] wheresoever
[wherever] the carcass is, there will the eagles be gathered together.

The Actual End of the World. VERS. 29–31.

29 [But, δέ] Immediately after the tribulation of those days [the judgments of the New Tes-
tament period of salvation] shall the sun [the sun shall] be darkened, and the moon shall
not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens
30 shall be shaken: And then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven: and

then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn [celebrate the great funeral of the world], and they
shall [and shall] see the Son of man coming in [on, ἐπί] the clouds of heaven with
31 power and great glory. And he shall [will] send his angels with a great sound[16] of a
trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of
heaven to the other.

Suddenness of the Catastrophe. VERS. 32–44.

32 Now learn a parable [the parable, τὴν παραβολήν, *i. e.*, of the sudden appearance of the end
of the world] of [from] the fig tree; When his [its] branch is yet [is already become,
ἤδη—γένηται] tender, and putteth forth leaves,[17] ye know that summer *is* nigh [near, ἐγγύς,
33 as in ver. 33]: So likewise ye, when ye shall see all these things, know that it is near,
34 *even* at the doors. Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass [away], till all
35 these things be fulfilled [are done, γένηται]. Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my
36 words shall not pass away. But of that day and hour knoweth no *man* [one], no, not
37 the angels of heaven [nor the Son],[18] but my [the][19] Father only. But as the days of
38 Noe [Noah] *were*, so shall also [so shall be][20] the coming of the Son of man be. For
as in the days that were before the flood [as in the days before the flood] they were
eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day that Noe [Noah]
39 entered into the ark, And knew not until the flood came, and took them all away; so
40 shall also [shall be][21] the coming of the Son of man be. Then shall two [*men*] be in
41 the field; the one [one, εἷς] shall be taken, and the other left. Two *women shall be*
42 grinding at the mill; the one [one, μία] shall be taken, and the other left. Watch
43 therefore; for ye know not what hour [day][22] your Lord doth come. But know this,
that if the goodman [master] of the house [ὁ οἰκοδεσπότης] had known in what watch
the thief would come, he would have watched, and would not have suffered his house
44 to be broken up [through].[23] Therefore be ye also ready: for in such an hour as ye
think not the Son of man cometh.

[1] Ver. 2.—[The best ancient authorities, including Cod. Sinait., omit Ἰησοῦς, and read: ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 2.—The omission of οὐ in Codd. D., E., is an emendation.

[3] Ver. 6.—[Ὁρᾶτε, μὴ θροεῖσθε, Meyer: *Sehet euch vor, erschrecket nicht;* Lange: *Schauet auf, doch erschrecket nicht, i. e.*, Look up, but be not frightened; Conant: *Take heed, be not troubled.* Μή is not to be connected with ὁρᾶτε, since in this case it would require θροῆσθε instead of θροεῖσθε. Hence there must be a comma after ὁρᾶτε, as in the best editions. *See* Conant *in loc.* and Winer, §56, 1st footnote.—P. S.]

[4] Ver. 6.—Lachmann, after Codd. B., D., L., etc., omits πάντα.

[5] Ver. 7.—Καὶ λοιμοί is omitted in Codd. B., D., E., by Lachmann, Tischendorf [also by Tregelles and Alford]. The omission may be explained from the similitude of the preceding λιμοί, but the connection requires λοιμοί. [Cod. Sinait. reads: σεισμοι και λιμοι, reversing the order and omitting λοιμοί. Famines and pestilences are usual companions, hence the proverb: μετὰ λιμὸν λοιμός. The etymological signification of these cognate terms is a pining or wasting away.—P. S.]

[6] Ver. 15.—[Luther and Lange: *Gräuel der Verwüstung;* Ewald: *Gräuel des Erstarrens;* Meyer: *das Scheusal der Verwüstung;* Vulg.: *abominatio desolationis*, whence our English Version, of which Conant says: "No substitute can be given for this pregnant form of expression. The Hebraism is as natural and intelligible in English as in the Greek; and any solution of it is comparatively weak and tame in expression." *See* Lange's *Exegetical Notes in loc.*—P. S.]

[7] Ver. 15.—[Fritzsche, Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles read: ἑστός, with a number of the best uncial MSS., but Meyer and Alford defend the *text. rec.*: ἑστώς, and regard ἑστός as a grammatical correction in ignorance that ἑστώς is neuter. *See* Matthiæ, p. 446, and Meyer *in loc.*—P. S.]

[8] Ver. 15.—[Ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοείτω, a parenthetic remark of the Evangelist (hence ἀναγινώσκων instead of ἀκούων), and by Lange printed in small type: *Der Leser merke auf;* Conant: *let him that readeth mark;* Campbell: *reader, attend.*—P. S.]

[9] Ver. 17.—[The critical editions, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, read: τὰ ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας, *the things out of the house*, instead of τι (*anything*). But Lange, in his Version, prefers the *text. rec.* (*etwas*), which is supported by Cod. D., Irenæus, and many authorities, and preferable as to sense. Cod. Sinait. reads τά.—P. S.]

[10] Ver. 18.—The singular: τὸ ἱμάτιον, is supported by Lachmann, [Tregelles, and Alford, but not by Tischendorf], according to many ancient authorities, [also Cod. Sinait.], and is more appropriate than the plural, τὰ ἱμάτια. He who is already dressed for the field needs only his cloak for the journey.

[11] Ver. 21.—[*Ever* is an emphasizing insertion of King James's revisers, and should be omitted as in the Authorized Version of the parallel passage, Mark xiii. 19, where the Greek Testament reads as here; οὐ μὴ γένηται.—P. S.]

[12] Ver. 22.—[Or: *for the sake of the chosen* (διὰ τοὺς ἐκλεκτούς). All the earlier English Versions, from Wiclif's to that of the Bishops, have *chosen* for *elect*, and Conant defends it as preferable. The revisers of King James are inconsistent, rendering the word ἐκλεκτοί: *chosen* in Matt. xx. 16; xxii. 14; Luke xxiii. 35; Rom. xvi. 13; 1 Pet. ii. 4, 9; Rev. xvii. 14, but in all other passages: *elect.* If *elect* be retained, it should be changed: *for the sake of the elect*, which is smoother than *for the elect's sake*, before *those.*—P. S.]

[13] Ver. 24.—[Ὥστε πλανῆσαι, εἰ δυνατόν. *See* Conant *in loc.*, who also changes the authorized rendering of πλανῆσαι, *to deceive*, into: *to lead astray*, in this whole chapter.—P. S.]

[14] Ver. 27.—Καί, after ἔσται, is omitted in [Cod. Sinait.], B., D., al., Lachmann, Tischendorf, [Tregelles, Alford].

[15] Ver. 28.—Codd. B., D., L., [Sinait.], Lachmann, Tischendorf, [Alford], omit γάρ, *for*.

[16] Ver. 31.—Φωνῆς is wanting in L., Δ., al. Other authorities have it before σάλπιγγος, or after it with καί. [Lange: *mit einer Posaune von lautem Schall;* Ewald: *mit lautem Posaunenschall.*]

[17] Ver. 32.—Ἐκφύῃ. [Ὁ κλάδος is the subject, as in the E. V.] Fritzsche, Lachmann, al., write ἐκφυῇ (*et folia edita fuerint*).

[18] Ver. 36.—Codd. B., D., al., add: οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός. Probably an insertion from Mark xiii. 32. Contra Origen, Athanasius, Jerome. [Cod. Sinait. has likewise the addition οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός after οὐρανῶν, and Lachmann adopts it in the text. Its omission may be more easily explained from doctrinal prejudice than its insertion from the parallel passage in Mark. Jerome, however, says that some Latin MSS. read *neque filius*, but "in Græcis, et *maxime Adamantii et Pierii exemplaribus hoc non habetur adscriptum*," and according to Athanasius it was alleged at the Council of Nicæa, A. D. 325, that these words were in Mark only.—P. S.]

[19] Ver. 36.—[The critical sources of Lachmann and Tregelles omit μου after ὁ πατήρ. It is missing in Cod. Sinait. as well as in Cod. Vaticanus. But Tischendorf and Alford retain it.—P. S.]

[20] Ver. 37.—[Οὕτως ἔσται, without καί, which is thrown out in all critical editions, and probably inserted from the parallel passage in Luke xvii. 26.—P. S.]

[21] Ver. 39.—[Οὕτως ἔσται, as in ver. 37, without the καί of the *text. rec.* *See* the critical editions. Dr. Lange, however, retains it in both cases.—P. S.]

[22] Ver. 42.—Codd. B., D., [Sinait.], etc., Lachmann, Tischendorf, Rink, Meyer, [Tregelles, Alford], read: ἡμέρᾳ. The received reading: ὥρᾳ, is probably taken from ver. 44 as a more exact term.

[23] Ver. 43.—[Διορυγῆναι, lit.: *dug through;* but διορύσσειν "was applied to any mode of forcing an entrance into a dwelling or storehouse for plunder." (Conant.)—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Literature on the General Subject.—Dorner: *De Oratione Christi Eschatologica*, Stuttgart, 1844. R. Hoffmann: *The Second Coming, and the Sign of the Son of Man in the Heavens, Leipz.* 1850. W. Hoffmann: *The Last Things of Man*, 2d ed., Berlin, 1856. C. J. Meyer*: *The Eschatological Discourses in Matt. xxiv. and xxv.*, Frankf. a. d. O. 1857. Cramer: *The Eschatol. Disc. of Christ, Matt. xxiv. and xxv.*, Stuttg. 1860.

Luke has introduced many of these subjects at an earlier point, ch. xii. and xvii. Following in Luther's track, Schleiermacher, Hase, and Neander made Luke's the original account; but de Wette and Meyer, and especially also C. J. Meyer in the monograph quoted, have successfully contended against this view. Matthew is undoubtedly the leading authority in all the discourses which have direct reference to theocratic relations; and any one must perceive the exceeding care which he has spent on all the Lord's words upon this subject. The order which we have given above in the division of the text, is substantially the same as is given in the Latin dissertation of Ebrard on the eschatological passages of the N. T. (*Dissertatio adversus erroneam nonnullorum opinionem, qua Christus Christique apostoli existimasse perhibentur, fore ut universum judicium ipsorum ætate superveniret.* Erlangen, 1842), and in his *Kritik der Evangel. Geschichte*, p. 497. On the law of cyclical representation, consult my *Leben Jesu*, ii. 3, p. 1558. According to Dorner, vers. 4–14 exhibit the development of the gospel; while what follows, from ver. 15, exhibits the historical process of the Christian religion. Meyer regards the section to ver. 5 as a preparatory warning against false Messiahs; then a continuous exhibition of the future down to the destruction of the temple. De Wette also has failed to discern the organic construction of the discourse. Stier distinguishes a second coming of Christ, Matt. xxv. 31, from the first coming, ch. xxiv. 29, but without support from the rest of Scripture; although it is equally baseless to regard the coming of Christ to the first resurrection as altogether spiritual. C. J. Meyer understands Matt. xxiv. 29–31 of the judgment upon Jerusalem; a view which has no foundation in the text, and which overturns the cyclical organization of the whole prophecy. According to this view, it is in ver. 35 that the end of the world begins to be referred to.

* [Not the Commentator with whom the Edinb. trsl. confounds him, and whose Christian name is Heinrich August Wilhelm.—P. S.]

First Cycle.

General Sketch of the Last Things down to the End of the World. Vers. 1–14.

Ver. 1. **To shew Him the buildings of the temple.**—Not merely the temple proper, ναός, but the collective ἱερόν, and not only the structure, but the various structures composing the temple. The Herodian consummation of the temple of Zerubbabel (Joseph. *Antiq.* xv. 11; *Bell. Jud.* v. 5) was begun in the eighteenth year of Herod's rule (about 20 B. C.). The temple itself was finished (by the priests and Levites) in one year and a half; the outer courts in eight years. "But the successors of Herod went on, at intervals, with the outbuildings, down to the beginning of the Jewish war; and Josephus tells us (*Antiq.* xx. 9, 7) that the temple was not finished until the time of the last procurator but one, Albinus: comp. John ii. 20." Winer. Josephus described with admiration the magnificence of the buildings, *Bell. Jud.* v. 5, 6 [and *Antiq.* xv. 14].*—And with this wonderful house of the theocracy Jesus would have nothing to do, because the house, forsaken of the Spirit, had become a spiritual ruin. The new temple seemed to promise a new spring of the Jewish theocracy: Jesus spoke of the end of the temple, and city, and all the old economy of things. They pointed His attention to the temple, which they, sons of Galilee, had so often contemplated with amazement as the grandest or the only sanctuary upon earth; referring probably to the declaration of Jesus in ch. xxiii. 38 (Chrysostom, Wolf, Meyer; *contra*, de Wette) with deep emotion, almost doubting, or at least interceding for the temple, that Christ might prevent it from falling into ruins.

Ver. 2. **See ye not all these things?**—Casau-

* [The marble, he tells us, was so white that the building appeared at a distance like a mountain of snow, and the gilding as dazzling as the rays of the sun. Some of the stones were forty-five cubits long, five high, and six broad. Even Tacitus speaks of the extraordinary magnificence of the Herodian temple.—P. S.]

bon, and many others, startled by this sentence, have proposed to omit the *οὐ*.* Paulus : *Do not look too much at these things ;* but this would require *μή* instead of *οὐ*. De Wette, following Chrysostom : Do ye not marvel *at all this magnificence ?* Meyer's interpretation is still more unfounded and untenable : *Do ye not see all this ?* namely, the vision of Jesus concerning the destruction of the temple, as something present before His eyes.† But the expression is rhetorical, and introduces what follows: Do ye not really see all these things yet ? Soon shall ye see them no more. The judgment will come :—the destruction of the city ; the burning of the temple ; Hadrian's statue of Jupiter upon the site ; Julian's vain attempt to rebuild it ; the mosque of Omar.

[**Verily I say unto you**, etc.—A most remarkable prophecy, uttered in a time of profound peace, when nobody dreamed of the possibility of the destruction of such a magnificent work of art and sanctuary of religion as the temple at Jerusalem ; a prophecy literally fulfilled forty years after its utterance, fulfilled by Jewish fanatics and Roman soldiers in express violation of the orders of Titus, one of the most humane of the Roman emperors (called *deliciæ humani generis*), who wished to save it. And Josephus, the greatest Jewish scholar of his age, had to furnish from his personal experience the best commentary on our Saviour's prophecy, and a powerful argument for His divine mission !—P. S.]

Ver. 3. **Upon the Mount of Olives.**—On the prospect from the Mount of Olives over the city, *see* the description of travellers.‡

The disciples came unto Him privately.—Asking Him confidentially. The *κατ᾽ ἰδίαν* refers to no distinction between the Twelve and other men. It indicates indefinitely that distinction among the disciples themselves, which Mark notes more distinctly in ch. xiii. 3. The confidential disciples, to whom He disclosed these things, were Peter, James the Elder, and John ; to whom Andrew was added, who had a sort of seniority among the disciples.

When shall these things be ? and what shall be the sign ?—Two distinct questions. The first refers to the time of the destruction of Jerusalem ; the other, to the signs of the advent of Christ and the end of the world. They were sure that the coming of Christ would bring in the end of the world ; but they did not apprehend that the destruction of Jerusalem would itself be a sign of the coming of Christ. This distinction is important for the interpretation of the whole chapter. The Rabbins spoke of the *dolores Messiæ*, according to Hos. xiii. 13, and other places (Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* p. 700) as the premonitory signs of the advent of the Messiah.§

Thy coming.—The *παρουσία*, 1 Cor. xv. 23 1 John ii. 28 ; Matt. xxiv. 37, 39 ; 2 Thess. ii. 1, 8, etc. Before, this had been regarded as in antithesis to the time of Old Testament expectation—in which the first and second coming of Christ coincided ; but here it is specifically viewed as the period of His last coming in glory. The *παρουσία* is the *ἐπιφάνεια* of 2 Thess. ii. 8 ; 1 Tim. vi. 14, etc., in antithesis to the times of the hidden influence and government of Christ. The *παρουσία* refers to time ; the *ἐπιφάνεια* to space. The question of the disciples shows that they no longer entertained the notion of the palm-entry being the advent. After the great event of the resurrection, they did indeed venture to hope that that advent was already beginning, Acts i. 6 ; but after the ascension they expected His coming from heaven, according to the heavenly intimation in Acts i. 11 ; iii. 20.

And of the end of the world.—Meyer: "There is in the gospels no trace whatever of a millennarian apocalyptical view of the last things." But Meyer overlooks that the *συντέλεια* is the germ itself of the expectation of the millennarian kingdom which afterward was fully developed (Rev. xx.). From the fact that the *συντέλεια* should come suddenly, it does not at once follow that it should come and end at once. It embraces a period, the stages of which are clearly intimated, not only in 1 Cor. xv. and the Apocalypse, but also in Matt. xxv. and John v.—*Τοῦ αἰῶνος*.—"The *αἰὼν οὗτος*, which ends with the advent, as the *αἰὼν μέλλων* then begins. The advent, resurrection, and judgment, fall upon the *ἐσχάτη ἡμέρα*, with which the *καιρὸς ἔσχατος* (1 Pet. i. 5), the *ἔσχαται ἡμέραι* (Acts ii. 17 ; 2 Tim. iii. 1), that is, the stormy and wicked end of the *αἰὼν οὗτος* (*see* Gal. i. 4), are not to be confounded." Meyer. [It should be kept in mind that when the "end of the world" is spoken of in the N. T., the term *αἰών*, the present dispensation or order of things, is used, and not *κόσμος*, the planetary system, the created universe.—P. S.]

Ver. 4. **Take heed that no man deceive you.**—The practical issue of all discussion of the last things.

Ver. 5. **For many shall come**, etc.—De Wette: "It cannot be shown that there were any false Christs before the destruction of Jerusalem. Bar-Cochba (Euseb. iv. 6) appeared after that event (the deceiver Jonathan in Cyrene, Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* vii. 11, is not described as a false Messiah). The deceivers of whom the Acts of the Apostles and Josephus speak (Acts v. 36 ; comp. Joseph. *Antiq.* xx. 5, 1 ; 8, 9 ; 21, 38 ; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 13, 5), did not play the part of Christs. Church history generally knows of none who gave himself out as the Christian Messiah." Here are almost as many errors as words. 1. We have not to do here with the specific signs of the destruction of Jerusalem, but with the general signs of the end of the world. 2. All those are essentially false Messiahs who would assume the place which belongs to Christ in the kingdom of God. It includes, therefore, the enthusiasts who before the destruction of Jerusalem appeared as seducers of the people ; *e. g.*, Theudas, Dositheus, Simon Magus, etc. 3. Every one who gave himself out as the Messiah, gave himself out as the Christian Messiah ; for Messiah means Christ. That no pseudo-Messiah could announce himself as Jesus of Nazareth, is obvious of

* [A similar case of the interrogative use of *οὐ* is John vi. 70: *οὐκ ἐγὼ ὑμᾶς τοὺς δώδεκα ἐξελεξάμην, κ.τ.λ.*—P. S.]

† [The Edinb. trsl., overlooking the *sc.* (*scilicet*, namely), the *noch haltloser*, and the *vielmehr* of the original, makes Lange here *defend* the interpretation of Meyer, which he expressly *rejects*.—P. S.]

‡ [The siege of Jerusalem began at the Mount of Olives (lit.: *the* Olives, *τῶν ἐλαιῶν*), and at the passover, the place and time of this prophecy. Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* v. 2, 3 ; vi. 9, 3.—P. S.]

§ [The late Judge JOEL JONES, of Philadelphia (*Notes on Scripture*, p. 311, as quoted by Dr. Nast) and Dr. W. NAST (*Com. in loc.*) refer the inquiry of the apostles to one and the same event, concerning which they wished to know the time and the sign, and understand the *παρουσία* of the personal coming of Christ which would bring about the end of the present world and the establishment of His kingdom. In the view of the disciples at that time these two events coincided, and one and the same sign they imagined would serve for both. Otherwise Nast falls in with Lange's interpretation of this whole chapter.—P. S.]

itself. Moreover, every man was a false Christ who pretended to assume the place of Christ; *e. g.*, Manes, Mohammed. For modern false Messiahs among the Jews, *see* the Serial *Dibre Emeth, or Words of Truth.* Breslau, 1853–4.

In My name.—Properly, *on My name:* on the ground of My name.

Ver. 6. **Ye shall hear.**—As it respects the seductive side of these false Messiahs, they were to be on their guard; but as it respects this fearful side, they were not to be afraid.

Of wars, and rumors of wars. — Meyer: "Wars in the neighborhood, where we hear the uproar and confusion ourselves; and wars in the distance, the rumors of which only are heard."* De Wette: "Rumors of wars, *i. e., future* wars in prospect. . . . Even wars and calamities they were not to take as signs of His coming. Such wars we cannot find before the destruction of Jerusalem." Meyer likewise denies the reference to facts preceding the destruction. But this springs from misunderstanding of the construction of the discourse. Here all wars are meant down to the end of the world; and certainly there are enough of them to be found. Wetstein, taking it for granted that wars before the destruction of Jerusalem must be meant, refers us to the wars of the Jews, under Asinæus and Alinæus, with the Parthians in Mesopotamia (Joseph. *Antiq.* xviii. 9, 1), the wars of the Parthians with the Romans, etc.†

The end is not yet.—The end of the world, as in vers. 13 and 14. So Chrysostom, Ebrard, de Wette. Meyer, on the contrary: the end of the tribulations here spoken of. But this falls with his erroneous construction of the whole discourse.

Ver. 7. **Nation shall rise against nation, kingdom against kingdom.** — Meyer: Wars of races, and wars of kingdoms. But wars were spoken of in the preceding verse. Here, the subject is great political revolutions in the world of nations: migrations of nations, risings, judgments, blendings, and new formations of peoples.

There shall be famines, and pestilences, and earthquakes.—De Wette and Meyer: These cannot be pointed out definitely. But they proceed on the fundamental error, that they must be pointed out before the destruction of Jerusalem. With regard to the famines, reference has been made to the dearth under Claudius, Acts xi. 28;* with reference to the earthquakes, to that in Asia Minor (Tacit. *Annal.* xiv. 26).† Certainly these are not enough of themselves; and κατὰ τόπους points to diverse places throughout the world. The passage combines in one view the whole of the various social, physical, and climatic crises of development in the whole New Testament dispensation. Wetstein and Bertholdt give specimens of Jewish expectation in regard to the *dolores Messiæ.*

Ver. 8. **These are the beginning of sorrows.**—The external, lesser, physical woes, as the basis of the greater moral woes to follow. The ὠδῖνες, *birth-pangs*, חֶבְלֵי הַמָּשִׁיחַ. Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* 700. The new world is a birth, as the end of the old world is a death.

Ver. 9. **Then shall they deliver you up.**—Meyer: *Then,* when what is here spoken of shall have taken place. A wrong division. It does not mean ἔπειτα in the external sense; although the internal procedure from worse to worse is intimated.

* [Alford refers the ἀκοαί πολέμων to the *three threats of war against the Jews* by Caligula, Claudius, and Nero, Joseph. *Antiq.* xix. 1, 2. We doubt very much whether prophecy is ever so specific.—P. S.]

† [I beg leave to quote a passage from my diary during the famous Southern Invasion of Pennsylvania under General R. E. Lee in June and July, 1863, which may throw some light on this passage, in its wider application to different periods of repeated fulfilment:

"MERCERSBURG, Pa., *June* 18, 1863. It seems to me that I now understand better than ever before some passages in the prophetic discourses of our Saviour, especially the difference between '*wars*' and '*rumors of wars*,' and the force of the command '*to flee to the mountains*' (ver. 16), which I hear again and again in these days from the mouth of the poor negroes and other fugitives. *Rumors of wars*, as distinct from *wars*, are not, as usually understood, reports of wars in *foreign* or *distant* countries—for these may be read or heard with perfect composure and unconcern—but the conflicting, confused, exaggerated, and frightful rumors which precede the approach of war to our *own homes* and *firesides*, especially the advance of an *invading* army, and the consequent panic and commotion of the people, the suspension of business, the confusion of families, the apprehensions of women and children, the preparations for flight, the fear of plunder, capture, and the worst outrages which the unbridled passions of brute soldiers are thought capable of committing upon an unarmed community. Such *rumors of wars* are actually often worse than war itself, and hence they are mentioned after the *wars* by way of climax. The present state of things in this community is certainly much worse than the rebel raid of Gen. Stuart's cavalry in Oct. last, when they suddenly appeared at Mercersburg at noonday, seized a large number of horses, shoes, and storegoods, and twelve innocent citizens as candidates for Libby prison, but did no further harm, and left after a few hours for Chambersburg. But now the whole veteran army of Lee, the military strength and flower of the Southern rebellion, is said to be crossing the Potomac and marching into Pennsylvania; we are cut off from all mail communication and dependent on the flying and contradictory rumors of passengers, straggling soldiers, run-away negroes, and spies. All the schools and stores are closed; goods are being hid or removed to the country, valuables buried in cellars and gardens and other places of concealment; the poor negroes—the innocent cause of the war—are trembling like leaves and flying with their little bundles 'to the mountains,' especially the numerous run-away slaves from Virginia, from fear of being re-captured as 'contrabands' and sold to the far South; political passions run high; confidence is destroyed; innocent persons are seized as spies; the neighbor looks upon his neighbor with suspicion, and even sensible ladies have their imagination excited with pictures of horrors far worse than death. This is an intolerable state of things, and it would be a positive relief of the most painful suspense if the rebel army would march into town."

Shortly after the above was written various detachments of Lee's army took and kept possession of Mercersburg till the terrible battles of Gettysburg on the first three days of July, and although public and private houses were ransacked, horses, cows, sheep, and provision stolen day by day without mercy, negroes captured and carried back into slavery (even such as I know to have been born and raised on free soil), and many other outrages committed by the lawless guerilla bands of Neil, Imboden, Mosby, etc., yet the actual reign of terror, bad as it was, did not after all come up to the previous apprehensions created by the "rumors of war," and the community became more calm and composed, brave and unmindful of danger. After the battles of Gettysburg, about a thousand wounded and mutilated rebel officers and soldiers were captured on their retreat to the Potomac, and left in the Theological Seminary at Mercersburg to be cared for by the very people who had been previously robbed and plundered by their comrades. Thus the peaceful scenes of good will and reconciliation followed the horrors of war, and the bitterness of strife gave way to the kindly sympathies and generous acts of human nature and of Christian charity. Unfortunately a year afterward (July, 1864), a band of rebels invaded Southern Pennsylvania again, and, unmindful of these acts of kindness, plundered Mercersburg, and burned the defenceless flourishing town of Chambersburg to ashes,—one of the most cruel acts in this cruel civil war.—P. S.]

* [Also to the *assiduæ sterilitates* of which Suetonius (*Claud.* 18) speaks, and the *fames* which Tacitus (*Annal.* xii. 43) mentions about the same time. There was also a pestilence at Rome about 65, which in a single autumn carried off 30,000 persons. (Sueton. *Nero* 39, Tacit. *Annal.* xvi. 13.) *See* Greswell, and Alford.—P. S.]

† [ALFORD *in loc.*, and others who refer the prophecy one-sidedly to the destruction of Jerusalem, mention here the great earthquake in Crete about 46 and 47, another at Rome in 51, a third and fourth in Phrygia in 53 and 60, a fifth in Campania (Tacit. *Annal.* xv. 22).—P. S.]

In that time of external convulsions, will the greater internal woes be experienced. Hence there is no contradiction to Luke xxi. 12.

And shall kill you.—Not merely persecute to death "some" of you. Decius, Diocletian, the Inquisition, religious wars of modern times. Certainly it is not exclusively the persecution under Nero.—**Kill you.**—The Apostles are here the representatives of all Christians.

Ver. 10. **And then shall many be offended.** —**Then** marks again the advancement of the suffering.—**And shall betray one another.**—Meyer: "The apostate shall betray the faithful man." But this does not bring out the whole strength of the ἀλλήλους, or the progression of the thought. This betraying one another includes the idea of delivering up to an unauthorized tribunal, *i. e.*, to the heathen magistrate or to the political power, which has no control over conscience; and the word, therefore, is appropriate to all political persecutions, which not only apostates have inflicted upon true Christians, but Christians upon Christians, Arians upon Catholics, and Catholics upon Arians, etc. (See this in all Church history, especially the history of all Protestant persecutions.)—**And shall hate one another.** —The perfect opposite to the vocation of all Christians, *to love one another*, John xv. 17.

Ver. 11. **Many false prophets.**—Not merely "extreme antinomian tendencies" in the stricter sense. The false prophet may be legalistic;* and that is another and higher form of Antinomianism.

Ver. 20. **Because iniquity or lawlessness shall abound.**—'Ανομία is not merely *immorality*. Apostasy from the internal spiritual laws of Christianity, or mental lawlessness, is iniquity itself. The dying out of true religion must be followed by the dying out of love among the many,—that is, the great majority of Christians. This dying out will be in its very nature gradual—a growing cold. Meyer, in opposition to Dorner, endeavors in vain to explain this of the apostolical age.

Ver. 13. **But he that shall endure unto the end.**—Endure in what, needs no explanation. It is the antithesis to apostasy from the faith—from the light of faith and the law of faith—and from love.

Unto the end.—(1) Krebs, Rosenmüller: Until the destruction of Jerusalem (σωθήσεται, flight to Pella, temporal deliverance). (2) Elsner, Kuinoel: Unto death. (3) Meyer: To the end of the tribulations.—It is obviously the end simply, the last day of the world; which comes preparatorily to every one in the day of his death, the last day of the individual Christian. The same holds good of the advent of Christ. Even as there is an internal advent in connection with the external and universal advent of Christ, so also there is an internal end of all things, earnest and rehearsal of the judgment,—the final testing and confirmation of the Christian's faith.†

* [*Nomistisch* is not: *legal enough*, as the Edinb. trsl. has it, which gives no sense in this connection, but *legalistic* in a bad sense as opposed to evangelical or truly Christian. Alford refers here to the plentiful crop of heretical teachers which sprung up every where in the apostolic age with the good seed of the gospel. Acts xx. 30; Gal. i. 7-9; Col. ii.; 1 Tim. i. 6, 7, 20; 2 Tim. ii. 18; iii. 6-8; 1 John ii.; 2 Pet. ii.; Jude, etc.—P. S.]

† [Alford refers the τέλος in its *primary* meaning to the destruction of Jerusalem, but in its *ulterior* meanings to the day of death or martyrdom for the individual, and to the end of all things for the Church at large.—P. S.]

Ver. 14. **This gospel [good news] of the kingdom.**—The *one* great joyful sign of the approaching end of the world, which contrasts with and outweighs all the preliminary sorrowful signs.

In all the world.—'Εν ὅλῃ τῇ οἰκουμένῃ must not be limited to the Roman Empire, as what follows plainly shows.

For a witness unto all nations.—Ancient expositors interpreted this of the conviction of the nations, and condemnation of the heathen. Grotius: In order to make known to them the stiffneckedness of the Jews (*pertinacia Judæorum*). Dorner: *Ita ut crisin aut vitæ aut mortis adducat.* Right, doubtless. The gospel is not merely to be preached to the nations, but to be preached εἰς μαρτύριον. Testified to them faithfully, even unto martyrdom, it will be a witness unto them; and then it will be a witness concerning them and against them.*

And then shall the end come.—The end of the world proper. Meyer again: "The end of the tribulations preceding the Messiah."

SECOND CYCLE.

The Specific Eschatology. Premonitory Signs of the End of the World. (a) The Destruction of Jerusalem; (b) the New Testament Period of Restrained Judgment. VERS. 15–22; 23–28.

Ver. 15. **When therefore ye see.**—De Wette and Meyer: The οὖν signifies—in consequence of the entering in of this τέλος. Ebrard: Jesus reverts to the first question, the answer of the second question being premised. Wieseler: Resumption of the thread broken off by the warning of vers. 3-14. Dorner: Transition from the eschatological principles of vers. 4-14 to the historical and prophetical application. The οὖν certainly signifies a transition to the announcement of the approaching destruction of Jerusalem—introduced now for practical application. But it looks back again to vers. 7-9, where the disciples are taken up into the figure, just as they afterward retire, and we hear no longer ὑμεῖς.

The abomination of desolation (βδέλυγμα ἐρημώσεως.—Dan. ix. 27, שִׁקּוּצִים מְשֹׁמֵם; comp. Dan. xi. 31; xii. 11. On the difficult place in Daniel, compare Hengstenberg, Hävernick, and Stier (*Discourses of Jesus*, on this passage). Hengstenberg (*Christologie des A. T.'s*, vol. iii. p. 494)

* [Dr. NAST, and others, regard ver. 14 as the cheering key-note echoing through and above all the doleful sounds of this prophecy. "Though ever so many dazzling pseudo-Messiahs arise, though bloody wars and wild tumult fill the world, though the existing order of things be overturned by the storm of revolutions or by the migrations of whole nations, though the earth be visited by devastating pestilence, or be shaken in its very foundations—notwithstanding all this, the gospel of the kingdom, of that glorious kingdom of God and His Anointed, shall be published to all nations, so that all may have an opportunity to accept it, and that it may be a witness against them if they reject it." Judge JONES: "The universal promulgation of the gospel is the true sign of the end, both in the [narrow and restricted] sense in which the disciples put the question and in the [wider and universal] sense, which in the Saviour's mind it really involved." The preaching of the gospel throughout the *Roman* world preceded the end of the Jewish State; the promulgation of the gospel throughout the *whole* world will be the sign of the end of the αἰὼν οὗτος. "The gigantic missionary operations of our days," says O. VON GERLACH, "have brought us considerably nearer to the fulfilment of this word of our Lord." ALFORD: "The *apostasy of the latter days*, and the *universal dispersion of missions*, are the two great signs of the end drawing near."—P. S.]

translates, "and over the top of abomination comes the destroyer." The top of abomination is then the summit of the temple desecrated by abomination; and upon this summit comes the desolater. But the desolater would then form an antithesis to the abomination. We venture to translate: "And even *to the summit* (double sense: *to the uttermost*, and to the top of the sanctuary, mentioned before) come the abominations, the ravagers (the singular instead of the plural, comp. Prov. xxvii. 9), and until destruction, which is firmly decreed, is poured out upon the wasters." *See* many other interpretations in Meyer's Com. [4th ed. p. 443]. The Sept. is in sense correct: καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ ἱερὸν βδέλυγμα τῶν ἐρημώσεων. Comp. 1 Macc. i. 55; 2 Macc. vi. 2. This *abomination of desolation* has been variously interpreted. (1) The Fathers: The statue of Titus [or Hadrian] supposed to have been erected on the site of the desolated temple,—which is questionable. (2) Jerome: The imperial statue, which Pilate caused to be set up (Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 9, 2). (3) Elsner, Hug: The raging of the zealots.* (4) Meyer: The vile and loathsome abominations practised by the conquering Romans on the place where the temple stood. (5) Grotius, Bengel, de Wette, and others: The Roman eagles, as military ensigns, so hateful to the Jews. This explanation we adhere to, as most consistent with βδέλυγμα. The Roman eagles, rising over the site of the temple, were the sign that the holy place had fallen under the dominion of the idolaters. (Comp. Wieseler in the *Göttingen Quarterly* for 1846, p. 183 sq.)

Spoken of by Daniel.—Wieseler: "Which is an expression of the prophet Daniel." As Daniel describes it.

In the holy place.—Mark xiii. 14, ὅπου οὐ δεῖ. Meyer insists that it was the temple ground; Bengel, de Wette, and Baumgarten-Crusius, Palestine generally, but especially the territory round Jerusalem, "because, after the capture of the temple, it would be too late to flee." This extends the meaning too far, while Meyer confounds the present passage with the text of Daniel. It was to be to the disciples a sign, when the abomination of desolation touched the holy place; and they were not to wait until it reached the temple. This, therefore, signified the beleaguering of the holy city. Jesus gives the longest term for delay; but does not forbid an earlier flight.

Let him that readeth understand.—This is not a word of Jesus, as Chrysostom and, after him, many have thought; which would in that case point to the reading of Daniel.† It is a word of the Evangelist (de Wette, Meyer), which seems to intimate the near approach of these signs, *i. e.*, the beginning of the Jewish war. The passage is important in its bearing upon the origin of this Gospel and the time of its composition.*

Ver. 16. **Flee into the mountains.**—This was fulfilled in the flight of the Christians to Pella: Euseb. iii. 5. Several Christians received, before the war, according to Eusebius, a divine direction for the congregation, that it should forsake the city and betake itself to Pella, in Peræa.

Ver. 17. **Let him not come down.**—This and the following are concrete descriptions of the most extreme haste in escape, in which they must not be hindered by any motives of selfishness or convenience. The allusion is to the flight of Lot from Sodom, and Lot's wife, Luke xvii. 32.—**Not come down.**—Some think this was a hint that they should flee over the flat roofs (Winer, sub v. *Dach*); according to Bengel, "*ne per scalas interiores, sed exteriores descendat.*" The manner of escape, however, was not described beforehand, here or elsewhere. It was said only, that no one must go down into the house again, to carry away with him all kinds of encumbrances.

Ver. 20. **Nor on the Sabbath.**—On the Sabbath the Jew might go a distance of only two thousand ells or cubits [about an English mile], Acts i. 12; Jos. *Antiq.* xiii. 8, 4. This ordinance was based upon Exod. xvi. 29. (Lightfoot on Luke xxiv. 50.) According to Wetstein, however, the Rabbins made many casuistical exceptions. De Wette asks: "How does this scrupulous anxiety agree with the Saviour's liberal view on the Sabbath?" Meyer explains, that many scrupulous Jewish Christians† would hardly be able to rise above the legal prescription concerning the Sabbath-journey. But both these forget that the Jewish custom with regard to travelling on the Sabbath [the shutting of the gates of cities, etc.] would make the Christians' journeying on that day infinitely more difficult, even although they themselves might be perfectly free from any scruple. They would, in addition to other embarrassments, expose themselves to the severest persecutions of Jewish fanaticism, and be denounced as apostates and traitors to the religion of their fathers.

Ver. 21. **For then shall be great tribulation.**—A sketch of the history of the destruction of Jerusalem. Comp. Luke xxi. 20 sqq., and Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* *Heubner:* "According to Josephus, not less than eleven hundred thousand Jews perished in this war. The siege took place at the time of the crowded festival. Since the rejection of Christ, the Jewish people has been in a state of slavery, and dispersed over the earth. Immediately after the war, ninety thousand were carried away." By the greatness of the terror, which the Lord only hints at circuitously, they were to measure the swiftness of their flight.

Ver. 22. **And except those days should be shortened,** ἐκολοβώθησαν.—What days? and how shortened? According to our view (*Leben Jesu*, ii. 3, 1269), the destruction of Jerusalem signified and was the actual beginning of the end of the world, inasmuch as it was the judgment upon the

* [So also Stier, Alford, Wordsworth, and Nast, who refer the words to the internal desecration of the temple by the Jewish zealots under pretence of defending it. *See* Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* iv. 6, 3. But Wordsworth in a long note, which "introduces much mystical and irrelevant matter," gives the prophecy of Daniel a wider application: (1) to the idol statue of Jupiter set up in the temple by Antiochus Epiphanes (comp. 1 Macc. i. 54, where that idol is expressly called: βδέλυγμα ἐρημώσεως ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον): (2) to the desecration of the zealots in the Jewish war; (3) to the setting up of the bishop of Rome on the altar of God, and the abominations of the papacy, "the man of sin sitting in the temple of God" (2 Thess. ii. 4).—P. S.]

† [Probably with reference to the words of the angel to Daniel (ix. 25): "Know therefore and understand." So Stier, Nast, Wordsworth.—P. S.]

* [Alford regards the words as an ecclesiastical note, like the doxology to the Lord's Prayer, vi. 13, for liturgical use. It must be admitted that in the first three Gospels there occurs no similar case of a subjective insertion calling attention to any event or discourse. But Alford's hypothesis is thrown out of the question by the unanimous testimony of the critical authorities in favor of the passage.—P. S.]

† [Not: *Jews and Christians*, as the Edinb. trsl. has it. *See* Meyer, p. 445.—P. S.]

Jewish people, which forms the counterpart of the world's judgment upon Christ, and because the heathen world was involved in the guilt and in the punishment of the Jewish world. Then *those days* are the days of the destruction of Jerusalem, as the days of the great preliminary judgment. Those days are, as days of judgment, represented as *shortened.* Lightfoot (with allusion to rabbinical notions about shortened days, in opposition to Josh. x. 13) and Fritzsche understand the word of the shortened *length* of the days. Meyer, on the other hand (following de Wette), refers the expression to the diminishing of the *number* of the days; and deduces from the saying generally the earlier occurrence of the end of the world itself (ver. 29).* But how should men be saved through their passing all the swifter out of the burning of Jerusalem into the burning of the entire world itself? The verb κολοβόω means to mutilate, to cut off. Thus, then, the days of the New Testament dispensation are, under the judicial point of view, or with reference to the judgment as already begun, *modified* days of judgment—*a season of grace.* To this points the conclusion, "no man would be saved." *Shortened*—that is, in the divine counsel.

The elect (Gen. xviii. 23) are not merely those who at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem were believers in Christ, but all who, according to the divine decree, should become believers down to the end of the world. Ebrard: There follows an *ætas paulo saltem felicior*, which Meyer denies, without sufficient reason, because he thinks that the hastening † of the end of the world will be the means of salvation for many. This is inconsistent with 2 Pet. iii. 9.

Ver. 23. **Then if any man shall say unto you.**—Meyer: Τότε, *then*, when the desolation of the temple and the flight shall take place. But this is inconsistent with what follows. The τότε points to the New Testament interval between the destruction of Jerusalem and the end of the world.

Ver. 24. **False Christs.**—The ψευδόχριστος must needs be an ἀντίχριστος, and conversely (*see* my *Positive Dogmatik*, p. 1267.)—**False prophets** must be understood only of false Christian teachers. Meyer thinks of false prophets among the Jews, according to Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 13, 4; Kuinoel, of such as should give themselves out to be prophets raised up from the dead,—Elias, or others; Grotius, of apostles of the false Messiahs. But compare, in opposition to all these, 2 Thess. ii. and Rev. xvi. 13. A Christian prophet is the announcer of a new development, or reform, or formation in the doctrine and life of the Church. A false prophet is an ecclesiastical revolutionist; which, however, he may be in a despotic or absolutistic sense, as well as in a democratic or radical. In the domain of doctrine, both characters may combine in one.

Great signs and wonders.—That is, such in appearance. Δώσουσι is not merely promise; nor is it in the real sense *give;* but somewhat as in a scenic representation,—promised with ostentation, and accomplished in appearance.

Ver. 26. **In the desert; in the secret chambers.**—In both cases, *Behold!* Not merely "apocalyptic painting," as Meyer says. *Behold* indicates sensation and excitement. The general idea is, that Christ is not identified with a particular party or sectional interest. Christ "in the desert," according to the analogy of John the Baptist in the wilderness, signifies the supposition that Christ would be found certainly in the ascetic and monastic form of life. In opposition to this view stands the declaration that he is ἐν τοῖς ταμείοις. The ταμεῖον means especially the chamber of treasure and provision; and Christ in the secret chambers points to the secular forms of millennarianism, that Christ is to be found in an external Church, with all its temporalities and glory. (Mormonism and Communism.)

Ver. 27. **For as the lightning.**—The lightning has indeed a place where it appears first; but it is universal in its shining, visible from the eastern to the western horizon. So will Christ at His appearing manifest Himself by an unmistakeable brightness, irradiating the whole earth. It is not here, then, the mere *suddenness* that is meant, but rather the *omnipresent, unmistakeable,* and *fearful visibility.* The majestic glory of the lightning, and its effect in purifying the air, are here silent concomitants.

Ver. 28. **Where the carcass is.**—A universal law of nature, which reflects the higher law of the moral, and especially of the Christian, world. The eagles here are carrion vultures which were numbered by the ancients with the race of eagles. Comp. Job xxxix. 30; Hos. viii. 1; Hab. i. 8. [Plin. *Hist. Nat.* ix. 3.] The figure gives a profound and strong expression of the necessity, inevitableness, and universality of judgment. As the carcass everywhere attracts the carrion-eaters, so do moral corruption and ripened guilt everywhere demand the judgment. The bearing of this proverbial word in the text is somewhat more difficult. The following are some interpretations: (1) Christ is the food (the carcass!), believers the eagles: Theophylact, Calvin, Calovius. (Jerome even went so far as to find in the πτῶμα a reference to the death of Christ.)*

* [Similarly Greswell and Alford, who refer to the various causes which combined to shorten the siege of Jerusalem: (1) Herod Agrippa had begun to fortify the walls of Jerusalem against any attack, but was stopped by orders from Claudius about 42 or 43. (2) The Jews being divided into factions, had totally neglected any preparations against the siege. (3) The magazines of corn and provision were just burned before the arrival of Titus (πλὴν ὀλίγου πάντα τὸν σῖτον, says Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* v. 1, 5). (4) Titus arrived suddenly, and the Jews voluntarily abandoned parts of the fortification. (5) Titus himself confessed that he owed his victory to God, who took the fortifications of the Jews (*Bell. Jud.* vi. 9, 1). "Some such providential shortening of the great days of tribulation, and hastening of God's glorious kingdom, is here promised for the latter times."—P. S.]

† [In German: *Beschleunigung*, and not *delay* as the Edinb. trsl. has it, thus perverting the original into the very opposite. Meyer (*see* his *Com. on Matt.* p. 335 sq. 3d ed., to which Lange refers, or p. 446 of the 4th ed. which I mostly use) confines the *elect* to the Christian believers at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, and hence thinks that the hastening of the end will facilitate their salvation by shortening the period of trial and probation and diminishing the danger of apostasy. But Lange differs from this view, as appears from the *ohne Grund*, and the reference to 2 Pet. iii. 9, both of which are omitted in the Edinb. trsl.—P. S.]

* [So also Chrysostom (the congregated eagles are the assembly of saints and martyrs) and Euthymius Zigabenus. Among modern interpreters Dr. Wordsworth soberly defends this untenable patristic interpretation: "As keen as is the sense of the eagle for the πτῶμα, so sharp-sighted will be true Christians to discern, and flock to, the body of Christ." The reason, he thinks (with Jerome), why Christ calls Himself here πτῶμα is, because He *saves* us by His *death.* He, too, quotes Ps. ciii. 5 and Isa. xl. 31 (as Jerome did before), to prove that saints may be compared to eagles who renew their youth and fly up with wings to Christ and will be caught up with Him in the clouds. But a reference of πτῶμα to the sacred body of the Saviour, which never saw corruption, violates every principle of good taste and propriety.—P. S.]

(2) The carcass means those who die to themselves; the eagles, the gifts of the Holy Spirit: Grotius. (3) Jerusalem and the Jews are the carcass; attracting the Roman legions with their eagles: Lightfoot, Wolf, de Wette (the last doubtful). (4) Meyer: "The carcass is a figure of the spiritually dead; and συναχθήσονται (that is, at the advent) οἱ ἀετοί represents the same as is described in ch. xiii. 41, that is, the angels sent out by Christ." Doubtless the figure of the eagles will express the necessity and inevitableness of the advent, as the figure of the lightning expresses the unmistakeableness and awful grandeur of its signs. But then the carcass must represent the moral corruption and decay of the world itself; and the eagles the judgment, not only in its personal, but also in its physical, elements and forces.* The only question is, whether the word merely looks back to ver. 27, or also to ver. 26. Käuffer thinks the latter exclusively: "Believe them not who say that Christ is here or there; they are *prædatores avidi.*" If we take the saying in ver. 28 as a conclusive glance back upon the whole section from 15 downward, the choice of the figure is at once explained. In the destruction of Jerusalem, the judgment will begin by the appearance of the great carrion eagles (there is included a manifest allusion to the Roman eagles). From that time it will go on through the whole new period; and find its expression in continuous local judgments throughout the gracious period of the shortened days of judgment: hence ὅπου ἐάν. At last the judgment will extend to the whole morally corrupt and spiritually dead world. Ver. 28 then comprehends and sums up the whole series of judgments from ver. 15-27.

Third Cycle.

The Specific Eschatology. The Appearance of the End of the World itself.—Vers. 29-44.

Ver. 29. **After the tribulation of those days.**—Here begins the representation of the end of the world, or rather the *beginning* of the end, the παρουσία, the advent of Christ. The θλῖψις τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐκείνων is not the same as the θλῖψις μεγάλη (ver. 21), which betokens the destruction of Jerusalem. It is rather a new θλῖψις, in which the restrained days of judgment under the Christian dispensation issue (ver. 22), and which are especially characterized by the stronger temptations of pseudo-messianic powers. Thus, when this θλῖψις of temptations has reached its climax (comp. 2 Thess. ii. 8; Rev. xiii.; ch. xiv.), then *immediately* (εὐθέως) the great catastrophe will come. Meyer, following de Wette and others [A. Clarke, Robinson, Owen], refers the *immediately* to what is said of the destruction of Jerusalem, and calls the dissenting explanations of Bengel, Ebrard, Düsterdieck, etc., dogmatic. But there is also a dogmatism of the abstract modern exegesis. The grounds of our distinctions in these crises are plain enough in the record: (1) The cyclical nature of the representation, after the analogy of the apocalyptic style; (2) the distinction between the destruction of Jerusalem and the New Testament period of mitigated and restrained woes. The favorite modern hypothesis most unreasonably places all the temptations described in vers. 24-26 in the time of the destruction of Jerusalem. But the εὐθέως describes the nature of the final catastrophe, that it will be at once swift, surprisingly sudden, and following upon a development seemingly slow and gradual. Thus, throughout the whole course of history, the swift epochs follow the slow process of the periods. We need not, however, translate εὐθέως by *suddenly*, *i. e.*, *unexpectedly*, with Hammond and Schott; but still less assume that the destruction of Jerusalem is here again introduced (Kuinoel).*

The sun shall be darkened.—Dorner, figuratively: "Sun, moon, and stars signify the Nature-worship of the heathen; the whole passage, therefore, must mean the fall of heathenism after the fall of Judaism." But it is manifest that the beginning of the cosmical end of all is the subject here; as in 2 Pet. iii. 12; Rev. xx. and xxi.; comp. Joel iii. 3 sqq.; Isa. xxxiv. 4; xxiv. 21; Dan. vii. 13.†

The stars shall fall from heaven.—Isa. xxxiv. 4. 1. The stars shall lose their light: Bengel, Paulus, Olshausen. 2. Allegorically: the downfall of the Jewish commonwealth: Wetstein, etc. 3. Dorner: "The fall of the heathen star-worship." 4. Augustine: Obscuration of the Church.‡ 5. Calvin: Phenomenal appearances of falling stars (*secundum hominum sensum*). 6. Meteors and shooting stars, popularly mistaken for real stars: Fritzsche, Kuinoel, de Wette [Owen]. 7. Meyer thinks that the words are to be understood *literally;* the stars in general being spoken of according to the notion that they were fixed in the heaven. (Comp. Knobel on Isa. p. 245.) This would ascribe an astronomical error to Christ, or make Him acquiesce in a popular error. 8. They may be limited to the stars which belong to the planetary family, of which this earth is one, and the falling of the stars may be understood of the dissolution of their planetary connection with the sun: that is, the idea is here poetically

* [Similarly Alford: The πτῶμα is the whole world, the ἀετοί the angels of vengeance. *See* Deut. xxviii. 49, which is probably here referred to; also Hosea viii. 1; Hab. i. 8.—P. S.]

* [Alford thinks that all the difficulties connected with εὐθέως have arisen from confounding the *partial* fulfilment of the prophecy with its *ultimate* one. Wordsworth quotes from Glassius, *Philol. Sacra*, p. 447, the following remark on εὐθέως: "*Non ad nostrum computum, sed divinum, in quo dies mille sunt unus dies.*" Ps. xc. 4; 2 Pet. iii. 8. Hence the whole interval between the first and the second coming of Christ is called the *last time*, or the *last hour*, ἐσχάτη ὥρα, 1 John ii. 18: 1 Cor. x. 11; 1 Pet. iv. 7; Heb. i. 2, etc. In the Apostles' Creed, too, we immediately add to the article on the ascension and the sitting at the right hand of God, the words: "from thence He shall come again to judge the quick and the dead." Dr. Nast, to avoid the difficulties which beset the ante-millennarian interpretation of εὐθέως (Stier, Ebrard, Auberlen, Alford), as well as that which refers vers. 29 sqq. to the destruction of Jerusalem (A. Clarke, and others), proposes a figurative interpretation of vers. 29-36, and sees here a picture of a "judicial visitation of nominal Christendom by Christ, in order to destroy all ungodly institutions and principles in Church and State, of which visitation the overthrow of the Jewish polity was but a type, and which itself is, in turn, the full type of the final and total overthrow of all powers of darkness on the great day of judgment." Consequently the Lord's coming, as described in vers. 29-36, would be merely a *providential* coming, which precedes His final, *personal* coming. *See* below.—P. S.]

† [Owen: A total eclipse of the sun. Whedon understands here visible phenomena of the heavens at the visible appearance of Christ. *See* Nast.—P. S.]

‡ [So also Wordsworth, who gives these words a double sense, a physical and spiritual: "The sun shall be darkened, —*i. e.*, the solar light of Christ's truth shall be dimmed, the lunar orb of the Church shall be obscured by heresy and unbelief, and some who once shone brightly as stars in the firmament of the Church shall fall from their place." Similarly Alford.—P. S.]

depicted, that the planetary solar system will be changed into a heavenly constitution, in which the planets will be independent of the sun, and themselves become self-enlightened stars (comp. Rev. xxi. 23). It is to be observed that *the heaven* (ἀστέρες ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ) and *the heavens* (αἱ δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν) are distinguished.

And the powers of the heavens (plural).—1. The common acceptation is, the host of stars. (Isa. xxxiv. 4; Ps. xxxiii. 6; 2 Kings xvii. 16.) 2. The angel-world: Olshausen, after the Fathers. 3. Revolution in cosmical relations and laws. (Lange's *Leben Jesu*, ii. 3, p. 1275.) *

Ver. 30. **And then shall appear.**—A cosmical transformation, which also affects the earth as in a transition state (Pollok's *Course of Time*), prepares the way for the sign of Christ; this announces His immediate coming.

The sign of the Son of Man.—1. Chrysostom [Hilary, Jerome, Wordsworth], etc.: The sign of a cross in the heaven. 2. Olshausen: The star of the Messiah (Num. xxiv. 17). 3. Fritzsche, Ewald: The Messiah Himself. [So also Bengel: *Ipse erit signum sui.* Luc. ii. 12.] 4. Schott: No other than what is described in ver. 29. 5. Rud. Hoffmann: "An appearance resembling a man, which was seen in the Holiest during the siege of Jerusalem." But this is, as Meyer objects, a mere fable related by Ben Gorion. 6. Meyer: "A luminous appearance, the forerunner of the δόξα of the Messiah;" de Wette, "a kind of Shechinah." † 7. But why not the Shechinah or the δόξα of Christ itself? It is the shining glory of the manifestation in general as distinct from the personal manifestation itself; comp. ch. xii. 38; xvi. 1; xvii. 2.

And then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, etc.—The expressions κόψονται, ὄψονται, have a striking alliteration, which cannot be imitated in the translation.‡ The former, κόπτεσθαι, does not mean merely a mourning in the common sense of the word, but a ritual, solemn lamentation, as in the penitent beating the breast, and especially the deep mourning over the dead; and ὄπτεσθαι means a significant and spiritually exalted, though real, beholding. Thus we must interpret the two words here. But it is to be especially noted that the tribes of the earth in both cases are so overpowered by the events, that they are involuntarily constrained to form, in the unity of their expressions of feeling, one chorus. Meyer: "*Mourn:* for, what total change in the state of things, what rending and revolution of all the relations of life, what decisive catastrophes will declare themselves to be at hand in the judgment and changing of the αἰῶνες!" The lamentation of penitence (Dorner) is not excluded. Ewald: "Then will the lamentation over the crucifixion of Christ so long delayed be taken up,"—rather, consummated; for Christendom § has continued that lamentation from the beginning.—**All the tribes of the earth.**—The races and peoples: intimating that social and political relations are now dissolved, and that the original national types of nature are now distinctly prominent.

Ver. 31. **And He shall send His angels.**—Meyer: "Out of the clouds of heaven, 1 Thess. iv. 16, 17; comp. afterward ver. 33" (?). But the passage 1 Thess. iv. 16 shows only that the faithful, who at the end of the world will be changed, or have part in the first resurrection, will joyfully go to meet the Lord at His coming in the form of spirit-life. But that the end of the world does not close in one moment, is taught by Paul also in 1 Cor. xv. 23, 24: "Christ is the first-fruits. Afterward they that are Christ's, when He shall come. Afterward the end." Between the first and the second crisis there intervenes a period; so also probably between the second and the third. This period is intimated in John v. 25; comp. v. 28. But in this present section a series of judicial acts are clearly distinguished. First, the judgment upon the clerical office, ver. 45; then upon the collective Church, ch. xxv. 1; then upon its individual members, ver. 14; finally, upon all nations, ver. 31. This series of judgments points to a period of the royal administration of Christ upon earth, which in the fuller eschatological development of Rev. xx. is represented in the symbolical form of a thousand years' kingdom. Thus, as the great crisis of the destruction of Jerusalem unfolds itself into a period which closes only with the appearance of Christ, so again the crisis of the appearance of Christ is the germ of a period which is consummated in the general judgment and the end of the world. But the millennial kingdom is, in its totality, the great last day of separation and cosmical revolution, out of which the present world will issue in heavenly glorification.—The sending of Christ thus collects together the faithful around the Lord upon earth; although the greeting and reception is to be regarded as conducted in the clouds, that is, at the point of transition between the old and the new spiritual kingdom.

With a great sound of a trumpet.—De Wette: "It is to be construed, either: *with a trumpet of loud sound*, or, better: *with a great sound of a trumpet.*" Compare קוֹל שׁוֹפָר חָזָק, Ex. xix. 16. Trumpets occur in the Old Testament in connection with the theophany, and in the New Testament in connection with the Christophany (1 Thess. iv. 16; 1 Cor. xv. 52; and in Rev.); probably, because they had a sacred use among the Israelites (Num. x. 1–10). Olshausen would fain understand the angel and the trumpet allegorically of the proclamation of the gospel by the Apostles. We prefer to place the emphasis here upon the trumpet. The Apocalypse distinguishes various trumpets, which follow each other, becoming more and more important, and therefore giving a stronger sound as they proceed. It speaks of seven trumpets (ch. viii. 6; xi. 15) And from this section it appears that by these eschatological trumpets are meant *cosmical* revolutions, as the theocratical trumpets signified social

* [Alford: "δυν. τ. οὐρανῶν, not the *stars* just mentioned; nor the *angels*, spoken of ver. 31; but most probably the greater heavenly bodies, distinguished from the ἀστέρες (Gen. i. 16), typically: the influences which rule human society and make the political weather fair or foul." —P. S.]

† [Similarly Alford, who refers to the star of the Wise Men for illustration, but at the same time inclines to the patristic view that this sign by which all shall know the approach of Christ, will probably be a cross.—P. S.]

‡ [Lange endeavors to render it in his German Version by: *stehen weinen* (*im Trauerchor*) und *sehen erscheinen* (*im Schauerchor*)—rather artificial. The Edinb. trsl. omits the allusion altogether.—P. S.]

§ [In German: *Die Christenheit*, *i. e.*, the whole body of Christians, but not: *Christianity* (German: Christenthum) as the Edinb. edition falsely translates here and elsewhere (comp. p. 394, note). So in the preceding sentence, this trsl. has *repeated* for *taken up*, mistaking the German *nachholen* (to fetch up, to make up for past neglect) for *wiederholen*. In the following sentence we read the "original *natural* types of nature," for *national* types (*nationale Naturtypen*),—no doubt a mere printing error.—P. S.]

revolutions among nations, and typical victories of God's people over the heathen. Meyer correctly observes that the individual angels are not here represented as blowing trumpets, but that the trumpet precedes the voice of the angel, as its preparatory cry, 1 Thess. iv. 16; that is, the cosmical signs precede the spiritual manifestations.

Ver. 31. **And they shall gather together His elect.**—Here the resurrection of the elect (the first resurrection, primarily) is declared. Properly, gather together into one place, ἐπισυνάξουσι. Meyer: "That is, to Him where He is just about to make His appearance on earth."—**His elect.**—That is, with the appearance of the Lord, His Church also, hitherto scattered and concealed among the nations, will be fully united and appear in festable array. The bride of Rev. xxi. 9. Meyer refutes many spiritualizing and enfeebling interpretations; such as "the preaching of the gospel" (Lightfoot),—"the preservation of Christians at the destruction of Jerusalem" (Kuinoel).

Ver. 32. **Now from the fig-tree learn the parable,** ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς συκῆς μάθετε τὴν παραβολήν.—They were to take from the fig-tree a parable (not merely a similitude), namely, the particular parable which illustrates the sudden appearance of the end of the world. The peculiarity of the fig-tree is this, that the blossom comes before the leaf—the fruit leads on the leaves. Thus, when the leaves are unfolded, the summer or the harvest (θέρος) is nigh. The leaves here are the cosmical revolutions already mentioned; but the summer harvest is the advent of Christ itself. When the great signs appear, the Lord will soon come.

Ver. 33. **So likewise ye**:—who should make a special application of what is a natural observation of all. **When ye shall see all these things**:—not the signs from ver. 15 to ver. 29 (Meyer), but the cosmical signs of ver. 30, for which the others are preparatory.

That it is near, even at the doors.—(1) Olshausen: The kingdom of God. (2) Ebrard: The judgment. (3) Grotius, de Wette, Meyer: The Messiah. (4) *The end*, ἡ παρουσία καὶ ἡ συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος. For that was what the disciples were asking about, ver. 3; comp. ver. 14. Especially the former.

Ver. 34. **Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass away.**—1. Jerome: The human race.* 2. Calovius: The Jewish nation.† 3. Maldonatus: The creation. 4. De Wette, Meyer: That present generation. Luther: "All will *begin* to take place now in this time, while ye live:" that is, ye will survive *the beginning* of these events. So Starke, Lisco, Gerlach. But Christ here speaks of the end of the world. 5. The body of My disciples, the generation of believers. So Origen, Chrysostom, and others, also Paulus. Meyer raises here his usual protest against doctrinal prejudice involved; but what doctrinal interest could Paulus, the rationalist, have in this interpretation? *This generation* means the generation of those who know and discern these signs. Since the words of ver. 33, "*So likewise ye*," etc., could not have their literal fulfilment in the disciples themselves, the Lord extends the ὑμεῖς of ver. 33 by the ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη, ver. 34. But that He would have the word so understood, is proved by the declaration of ver. 35, "**My words shall not pass away.**" The words referred to are here the living words concerning these last things; and they do not pass away, only when and because they find in every γενεά of believers those who continuously carry on those words.—**Not pass away.**—This cannot mean, "not remain unfulfilled" (de Wette). That is self-understood, especially as "*heaven and earth*" had just been spoken of. The Lord here expresses His assurance that His words will remain eternal words in a perpetual Church—in a Church, also, disposed to look for and hasten unto the fulfilment of His words concerning the "last things."

[I add the note of Alford: "As this is one of the points on which the rationalizing interpreters (de Wette, etc.) lay most stress to shew that the prophecy has failed, it may be well to shew that γενεά has in Hellenistic Greek the meaning of *a race or family of people*. *See* Jer. viii. 3 in LXX.; compare ch. xxiii. 36 with ver. 35, ἐφονεύσατε . . . but *this generation* did not slay Zacharias—so that the *whole people* are addressed: *see* also ch. xii. 45, in which the meaning absolutely requires this sense (*see* note there): *see* also Luke xvii. 25; Matt. xvii. 17; Luke xvi. 8, where γενεά is predicated both of the υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, and the υἱοὶ τοῦ φωτός, Acts ii. 40; Phil. ii. 15. In all these places, γενεά is = γένος, or nearly so; having it is true a more pregnant meaning, implying that the character of one generation *stamps itself upon the race*, as here in this verse also.—This meaning of γενεά is fully conceded by Dorner; 'omnes reor concessuros, vocem γ. si eam vertas *ætas*, multas easque plane insuperabiles ciere difficultates, contextum vero et orationis progressum flagitare significationem *gentis*, nempe Judæorum.' (Stier, ii. 502.) The continued use of παρέρχομαι, in verses 34, 35, should have saved the commentators from the blunder of imagining that the then living generation was meant, seeing that the prophecy is by the next verse carried on to the end of all things; and that, as matter of fact, the Apostles and ancient Christians *did continue to expect the Lord's coming, after that generation had passed away*. But, as Stier well remarks, 'there are men foolish enough now to say, heaven and earth will never pass away, but the words of Christ pass away in course of time;—of this, however, we wait the proof.' ii. 505."—P. S.]

Vers. 34 and 35. **Till all these things be fulfilled.**—Schott, erroneously: "The destruction of Jerusalem." Fritzsche: "The signs of the coming." Better: Both the signs and the coming itself. The Scripture knows nothing, however, of an actual passing away of heaven and earth; only of a dissolution of the old condition of things in the transmutation of heaven and earth, 2 Pet. iii. 7, 8.

Ver. 36. **But of that day.**—Surely there is no contradiction here to ver. 34, but only to Meyer's and de Wette's exegesis of ver. 34, in which the Evangelist is asserted to have erroneously predicted that the then present generation would survive the end of the world. Meyer, indeed, thinks this the meaning, that, while all would take place during the time of that generation, the more exact statement of the day and hour was not to be given. But we have here rather that distinction between the religious measure of time and the chronological measure of time, which runs through the whole of the apocalyptic part of the New Testament (1 Thess.; 2 Thess.; 2 Pet. iii.; Apoc.). The key is to be found in 2 Pet. iii. 8.

* [Jerome is undecided: "*Aut omne genus hominum significat, aut specialiter Judæorum.*—P. S.]

† [So Dorner, Stier, Nast, Alford, and Wordsworth. The latter, however, assigns to γενεά a double sense, applying it first to the literal Israel, and then to the spiritual Israel, thus combining interpretation 2. with that *sub* 5.—P. S.]

Knoweth no one, but the Father only.—Meyer: "This excludes the Son, also." Mark xiii. 32; whose not knowing 'Lange wrongly changes into a holy unwillingness to know, or a self-limitation of knowledge.'"* But Sartorius has rightly understood and adopted my interpretation. The Son would not prematurely reflect upon that point as a chronological point of time, and the Church in that should imitate Him.†

Ver. 38. **For as . . . they were.**—**For,** explanatory. The *chronological* end of the world is concealed by its seeming prosperity in the last days, as in the days of the flood. They **ate,** etc., emphatically: in the original all are participles, τρώγοντες, etc. [which can be better rendered in English: *they were eating and drinking,* etc., than in the German.—P. S.]. They lived as those who were only eating, etc.

Ver. 39. **And knew not until.**—They knew nothing of what was coming; nothing even then when Noah went into the ark before their eyes.

Ver. 40. **The one shall be taken.**—According to ver. 31, to be explained of the being gathered together by the angels. The view of Wetstein and others, that the one is taken captive and the other allowed to flee, is contrary to the connection, and has a false reference to the destruction of Jerusalem.

Ver. 41. **Two women shall be grinding,** ἀλήθουσαι.—The employment of female slaves, Exod. xi. 5; Isa. xlvii. 2, etc. "As now in the East, women, one or two together, turn the handmills* (Rosenmüller: *Morgenland;* Robinson: *Palestine*). These slaves sit or kneel, having the upper millstone in their hands, and turning it round on the nether one, which is fixed.

Ver. 43. **But know this.**—How momentous the not knowing the hour is, the instance of the householder shows. As he does not know the hour of the breaking in, he must always provide for the safety of his household. But if he knew the time and the hour, the necessity of constant watchfulness would not exist. The similitude of the thief is further extended, 1 Thess. v. 2, 4; 2 Pet. iii. 10; Rev. iii. 3; xvi. 15. The *tertium comparationis* is the perfect surprise; and the figure has its application, not only to the end of the world, but also to the hour of death, and to those tragical catastrophes which occur in the history of nations as well as in the lives of individuals. All these critical periods are connected with the final judgment, and form with it one whole.

Ver. 44. **Therefore be ye also ready.**—Because it is the fundamental law of watchfulness to be *always* watching; and because the Son of Man will be generally unexpected when He comes,—*therein* like a thief in the night, that is, at a time when the world will be buried in profound sleep. When they first open their eyes, the great robbery will have been effected; all their old and worldly state, in which they had found a false life, will have been wrested from them forever.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *See* the preceding remarks. On the peculiar difficulties which exegesis finds in this eschatological discourse, compare de Wette and Meyer. In various ways it has been attempted to settle the meaning of the text, by a spiritual interpretation of many individual traits (Dorner), or by referring the whole to the destruction of Jerusalem (Michaelis). According to Credner, we would have here prophecies *ex eventu;* while Meyer maintains that they were not fulfilled at all in the manner here predicted, because the disciples confounded what Christ said of His ideal coming with what He said of His real or actual coming.* The school of Baur refer the signs preceding the coming, and the composition of St. Matthew's Gospel, to the time of Hadrian,—a supposition which was meant to serve the well-known Ebionite hypothesis [*i. e.,* that the Christianity of the original Apostles, as distinct from that of Paul, was essentially Judaizing, and did not rise far above the later heresy of Ebionism.—P. S.]. But, as it regards the uncertainty of exposition in this passage, it can be obviated only by making ourselves familiar with the cyclical method of apocalyptical representation. This is not to be confounded with what Bengel called the perspective view of the prophets, although it has some affinity with it (comp. my *Leben Jesu,* ii. p. 1259). According to the *perspective* view of the future, the successive critical events that lie behind each other, are brought near, so that the great *epochs* rise into light like the tops of mountains, while their times of unfolding, the *periods,* are concealed behind them, or

* [So I translate the German: *ein heiliges Nichtwissenwollen,* instead of the unintelligible Edinb. trsl.: *a sacred willing not to know.* Meyer objects to Lange's interpretation as previously given in his *Life of Jesus,* which he here reasserts.—P. S.]

† [Some fathers in the Arian controversy, and so Wordsworth among recent commentators, explain that Christ knew personally, but did not know *officially, i. e.,* did not make known, the hour of judgment;—but this is excluded by the plain meaning of *οἶδεν,* as well as by *οὐδείς* and *οἱ ἄγγελοι,* where such a distinction between personal and official knowledge is inadmissible. The older orthodox commentators generally took the ground that Christ knew the hour as God, but did not know it as *man;* but this rests on an abstract and almost dualistic separation between the divine and human nature in Christ. Alford honestly admits the difficulty, and assumes real ignorance for the time of Christ's humiliation. "The very important addition," he says, "to this verse in Mark: οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός, is indeed included in *εἰ μὴ ὁ πατὴρ μόνος,* but could hardly have been inferred from it, had it not been expressly stated, *see* ch. xx. 23. All attempts to soften or explain away this weighty truth must be resisted; it will not do to say with some commentators, '*nescit ea* NOBIS,' which is a mere evasion:—in the course of humiliation undertaken by the Son in which He increased in wisdom (Luke ii. 52), learned obedience (Heb. v. 8), uttered desires in prayer (Luke vi. 12, etc.),—*this matter was hidden from Him:* and this is carefully to be borne in mind in explaining the prophecy before us." But this is not satisfactory. It seems to me, we must assume here a *voluntary self-limitation* of knowledge, which is a part of the *κένωσις,* and which may be illustrated by the passage, 1 Cor. ii. 2, viz. the determination of St. Paul not to know any thing among the Corinthians (*οὐ γὰρ ἔκρινα τοῦ εἰδέναι τι ἐν ὑμῖν*), except Jesus Christ and Him crucified. Christ could, of course, not lay aside, in the incarnation, the metaphysical attributes of His Divine nature, such as eternity, but He could, by an act of His will, limit His attributes of power and His knowledge and refrain from their use as far as it was necessary for His humiliation. His voluntarily not knowing or "sacred unwillingness to know," the *day* of judgment during the days of His flesh, is a warning against chronological curiosity and mathematical calculation in the exposition of Scripture prophecy. It is not likely that any theologian, however learned, should know more, or ought to know more, on this point before the end than Christ Himself, who will judge the quick and the dead, chose to know in the state of His humiliation.—P. S.]

* [The Edinb. trsl. misunderstands this whole passage, and confounds the views of Credner and Meyer: "According to Credner *and Meyer.*" It also omits several important passages in this whole section.—P. S.]

are manifest only in less prominent signs. The *cyclical* contemplation proceeds according to the process of these epochs; but in such a way that the whole is in each case regarded under *its* characteristic aspect, and each new starting-point is treated as an object brought forward into the present. The starting-point of the first epoch in this chapter is that *Pseudo-Messianism* which began even in the apostolic age (Simon Magus). The second is the *Jewish war*. The third is the first commencement of the *cosmical phenomena and changes*. The view therefore goes on from the signs in the ecclesiastical world to the signs in the political world, and then on to the cosmical signs. They are the same stages by which Christianity glorifies the world.

2. Distinguishing between the historical and the spiritual coming of Christ, we find the principle of a twofold eschatological παρουσία in the evangelical history. Every victory of Christ in the world is a sign of His actual coming, and a symptom of His future advent. The personal resurrection of Jesus recurs, and is unfolded in the first and second resurrections. The outpouring of the Holy Spirit recurs, and is unfolded in the judgment and the glorification of the world. But these coincide in their historical influence; the manifestation of Christ in its spread goes on from the individual to the people, from the people to mankind, from the Church to the State, from the State to the universe, and so from death to the intermediate state, from this to the resurrection. But the consummate appearance of Christ is, in opposition to the first coming, the judgment; for, as the development of the seed is the harvest, so the development and consummation of redemption is separation and doom.

3. Stier (*Reden Jesu*, ii. 539) makes the ingenious remark, that St. John was directed to record, in harmony with his esoteric design, the last gracious promises of our Lord's coming again to comfort; while the Synoptists recorded His prophecies concerning the return for judgment. We have only to add, that St. John's eschatology was to be unfolded into a distinctive apocalypse.

4. *The Progress of the Last Events.*—The whole representation combines in one view the history of the nations and the history of the Church of Christ; the history of the earth with the history of mankind. From the personal history and glorification of Christ the world moves on in its development toward the end of the world, which will be at the same time the transformation of the world. Each cycle of it lays stress upon one particular stage of the development. Each stage has a Christian and a secular side. The first stage presents a picture of the whole development of the world under the Christological point of view, and in this the movement is more gentle. But more vehement is its progress from the beginning of the judgment, the destruction of Jerusalem, in the second stage. Finally, in the third stage, its swiftness is like the lightning from heaven.

5. *The Destruction of Jerusalem.*—Gerlach: "This period was rendered more terrible to the Jews than we can imagine, by the fact that with Jerusalem and the temple the ground of all their perverted faith and hope was taken away. The greater and the holier the truth is to which error has attached itself, the more heart-rending is the sorrow when those who are involved in that error at last open their eyes."

6. *The Doctrine of Antichristianity as the Shadow of Christianity.*—(1) The kingdom of evil among men goes on side by side with the kingdom of God, and takes the form of an anticipation and distortion of the fundamental principles of that kingdom. (2) As a false and carnal anticipation it is always one step ahead, as the monkey precedes man. (3) The kingdom of God develops itself in opposition to the kingdom of darkness, and *vice versâ*, and the one becomes mature in conflict with the other. (4) Pseudo-Christianity and Antichristianity are one in their principle and aim. (5) The last apparent triumph of Antichristianity brings on the last and full manifestation of the victory of Christ, even His parusia.

7. The assertion that the Apostles erred in the expectation of the *near* advent of Christ, rests on a confusion of the religious hope with an ordinary mathematical calculation, and of the majestic coming of Christ which is going on constantly in the process of history, with the last individual appearance.

8. Christians, waiting in a heavenly frame of mind for their Lord, will find that He is their Friend, their legitimate Lord, their Royal Bridegroom. If they think of His coming with an earthly mind, He appears to them as a thief, who will strangely and unrighteously break in upon their earthly relations and possessions.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Christ the great Prophet, as the prophesier of His advent and of the end of the world: 1. The great prediction accredits the great Prophet; 2. the great Prophet accredits the great prediction.—The fulfilled predictions of Christ are a pledge of the fulfilment of the remainder.—The solemn thought, how we are rushing on toward the final consummation.—The patience and the wrath of God, as seen in Christ's delineation of the last times: First, one day of time appears to stretch to a thousand years (the slow period); then a thousand years are as one day (the swift epoch, 2 Pet. iii. 4; comp. Ps. xc. 4).—The intercession of the disciples for the earthly temple, and the Lord's declaration.—The opposite points of view from which the Lord and the disciples regarded the building of Herod's temple: 1. To them it appeared just risen up in renewed magnificence; 2. to Him it already appeared fallen a spiritual ruin into the flames.—The Lord's look back from the Mount of Olives upon the city and the sanctuary of His people; or, the sacred night-discourse to the disciples concerning the end of the world.—The Lord corrects the question of His disciples about the last things: They ask first about the *when*, He answers with the *how*; they ask about the last signs, He points them to the collective preparatory signs; they ask what will come before the end of the world, He shows them what immediately impends over themselves.—The wisdom of prophecy a concealment and disclosure of the future.—We must, like the disciples, be assured that the Lord cometh for manifestation and decision: 1. That He cometh; 2. that before Him His sign cometh; 3. that with Him and after Him the end cometh.—Christ's three great pictures of the end of the world: 1. Their similarity; 2. their difference.

FIRST CYCLE (vers. 3-14).—The Lord's first word concerning the end: Take heed that no man deceive you.—His three words concerning the right preparation for the end: 1. Take heed (ver. 4); 2. see that ye (courageous and wakeful) be not troubled (ver. 6); 3. endure unto the end (in love, vers. 12, 13).—The signs of the coming of Christ and the result: 1. Ecclesiastical woes (false Christs, millennarian deceivers

of all kinds); 2. political woes (near and distant wars); 3. national woes (downfall and destruction of peoples and empires); 4. woes of nature (crises in the air and on the land; famines; pestilences; distress of human life; earthquakes); 5. woes of the abyss (persecution and apostasy); 6. all these woes pangs of birth (all must subserve the preaching of the gospel, and the spread of the kingdom of God among the nations. Apoc. vi.: The black horses behind the rider upon the white horse, his equipage and attendants).—The prophecy of the false Messiahs in its comprehensive and solemn meaning: 1. It refers not only to those who present themselves with the title of Christ (Jewish adventurers, Barcochba, etc.), but also to all who assume His place in relation to souls (self-constituted representatives of Christ, lords over conscience, leaders of sects, etc.); 2. it has been fulfilled in the literal and spiritual meaning, and in a fearful manner, for our warning.—See that ye be not troubled; or, he who knows how to read the Bible aright, will rightly read the newspapers as a Christian.—The true and Christian observation of the signs of the times.—All convulsions of the earth must glorify the everlasting word of heaven in its everlasting establishment (ver. 7): 1. They must confirm its prophetic truth; 2. they must subserve its victory; 3. they must announce and bring about the coming of Christ.—The natural signs of the coming of the Lord; or, how we must distinguish between the signs of superstition (comets, meteors, etc.) and the signs of faith (famines, etc.): 1. The former signs are, rightly understood, only signs of the order of things; 2. the latter, on the contrary, are signs of the revolution and derangement of things. They are internally connected, as the birth-pangs of nature (Rom. viii. 19), with the birth-pangs of the Church. —Ver. 9: The end of the old world is, that they hate one another; that is, that they are in despair as to all personal life.—Hatred in Christendom, the sign of a world in Christendom fallen under condemnation: 1. Hatred of Christianity; 2. hatred of confessions; 3. party hatred; 4. hatred in opinion. — To the wasted condition of the Church is opposed the prosperous error of the world, under the guise of reform,—that is, 1. erring announcers of the new; 2. new announcers of error.—The fanaticism of false ecclesiastical systems conjures the phantom of Antichristianity into the broad light of day.—Lawlessness is not the most elevated life, but is the consummate death of love.—False prophets proclaim love, and mean unbridled caprice, the death of love.—The consolation of Christ, and the kindness with which He interprets to His disciples famines and pestilences.—The convulsions of the earth signs of its preparation for the last events.—Earthly troubles collectively only the beginning of real woes.—Woes of martyrdom, religious wars, and apostasy, the heaviest woes. —The religious wars of later times in the light of Christ's prediction. — Every purer development of Christianity must excite the same hatred in the world within Christendom, which Christianity at first excited in the world at large.—The preaching of the gospel, or missionary efforts, the most comforting signs of the coming of Christ.—The preaching of the gospel, in its gradual extension over the earth, a confirmation of the gospel itself.—The gospel always opening up new worlds for its work of salvation: 1. The Græco-Roman (ancient Church); the German and Sclavonic (Middle Ages); the new world and all lands (evangelical period).—The preaching of the gospel throughout the world throws a consolatory light on the sufferings of the world.—The end of the world will be also the end of all ends.—The great death of the world, in which all the deaths of mortal humanity have their consummation and end.—The word *end*, in its endlessly rich significance: 1. How instructive; 2. how fearful; 3. how encouraging; 4. how full of promise.

SECOND CYCLE (vers. 15–28).—The abomination of desolation, the signal for Christians to fly to the mountains: 1. At the destruction of Jerusalem; 2. in the midst of Church history; 3. at the end of the world.—True separation from a state of things which is exposed to judgment: 1. Not premature, but in haste;* 2. not partial, but complete; 3. not stern, but gentle; 4. not with self-confidence, but with prayer.—The first congregation of Christ took counsel and warning by Christ's word, and were saved, for a type to us.—The destruction of Jerusalem in its everlasting significance: 1. A testimony to the truth of Christ; 2. a proof of His sympathy (vers. 19–21; comp. Luke xix. 41; xxiii. 28); 3. a demonstration of the severity of God toward His covenant-people, under the New Covenant as well as under the Old.—The great tribulation, such as never had been, and never will be again: 1. The centre of all judgments upon the old world; 2. the beginning and the sign of all final judgments.—In what sense the judgment upon Jerusalem was the end of the world: 1. It was the end of the manifestation of the kingdom of God in this state; 2. the death-struggle between the Jewish and the Gentile world; 3. the sign of that point of transition at which the judgment of the world upon Christ was changed into a judgment of Christ the King upon the world.—The New Testament day of grace in the light of burning Jerusalem: 1. A season of judgment cut short; 2. a fruitful time of grace (in which the vine flourishes beside the stream of lava over the volcano); 3. a time of temptation to apostasy from Christ to false prophets; 4. a time of the most forbearing patience and waiting for the final manifestation.—The Antichristianity of the last days, 2 Thess. ii.—Lying Christianity and Antichristianity one and the same under different aspects: 1. Lying Christianity is antichristian in assuming Christ's place; 2. Antichristianity exerts its influence through Christian means, which it perverts.—Go not forth to expect the appearing of Christ, but always rather retire within: 1. Not out into the waste wilderness; 2. within, into yourselves, communion with Christ.—Be not moved, not to say seduced, by false prophets and their lying wonders.—No human pomp shall herald Christ, but the lightning of God, which shineth from the rising of the sun to the going down thereof.—Where the carcass is, the eagles are gathered: a law of life,—1. pretypified in nature; 2. fulfilled, and being fulfilled, in the course of history; 3. waiting for its last realization at the end of the world.—This last saying holds good of individuals, as well as of whole nations and conditions.

THIRD CYCLE (vers. 29–44).—The end of the world: 1. In its nature and appearance (vers. 29–31); 2. in its time (vers. 32–36); 3. in its relations to the world (vers. 37–39); 4. in its judicial effect (vers. 40, 41); 5. as a great exhortation (vers. 42–44). Or, *the end of the world the consummation*,—1. of all the signs of heaven; 2. of all the funeral lamentations; 3. of all prophetical visions; 4. of all the revelations and glorifications of Christ; 5. of all the glad announcements of the gospel and assemblies of the

* [In German: *nicht voreilig, aber eilig*.—P. S.]

saints; 6. of all the surprises of the world at ease; 7. of all judgments and exhortations to watchfulness. Or, 1. As the end and consummation of the ancient judgments; 2. as the beginning and the germ of a new revelation. Or, 1. Viewed comprehensively in its cause, the appearance of the person of Christ; 2. extended in its influence over heaven and earth.—With the maturity of the Church all is mature: 1. Humanity; 2. the earth; 3. the world of stars; 4. the constitution of heaven.—The great testimony to the glory of the Son of Man at the end of the world: 1. The stars of heaven; 2. the families of earth; 3. the angels of God; 4. the elect of Christ.—The sign of the Son of Man; or, the manifestation of Christ in the glory of God (the Shechinah, Titus ii. 13).—The great funeral lamentation of the peoples at the death of the old world.—The beginning of sight, brought in by the appearance of Christ: 1. When all men will become seers; 2. and all visions will approve themselves to be tremendous realities.—The meaning of the trumpet in the history of the kingdom of God, Rev. viii.; ix.—Angels ministers of Christ in judgment as well as in salvation.—The end of the world the great and final redemption (Luke xxi. 28).—Judgment a result of redemption; separation of shell and kernel, corn and chaff, good and evil.—The leaf of the fig-tree a sign of all turning-points (catastrophes) in the history of the world.—How overwhelming in their surprise the great times of decision are!—The generation of Christians, as a generation of those who wait for Christ, never passes away.—The people of the Lord eternal like His word: 1. Through His word; 2. for His word.—How solemnly has the Lord sealed the secrecy of the last day!—How all days of judgment, from the time of Noah, have been preceded by the feast-days of carnal security.—Two in the field: the fellowship of the new world abolishes all the fellowships of the old.—The sudden effect of judgment: 1. Infinitely amazing and sudden (in the field, and at the mill); 2. rigorous in its separation (all kinds of companions and comrades); 3. embracing all (men, women, owners, slaves); 4. stately and tranquil (not to be received to the feast, means to be rejected).—Watch, the last word concerning the end of the world. The first was an exhortation to prudence, the last an exhortation to watchfulness and readiness.—The figure of the thief in the night; or, the fearful solemnity of the thought, that the Judge of the world may come at any moment: 1. At any moment for the world, seeing He is already on the way; 2. at any moment for thee, as thou knowest least *thy* last hour.—Readiness for Christ's advent diffuses somewhat of the brightness of His future glorification over life.—The anxious anticipation of the great feast of epiphany: 1. A joy with fear and trembling; 2. anxiety and trembling in the blessed joy and hope.

On Vers. 37-51 (Scripture Lesson for the 28th Sunday after Trinity).—Watchfulness is above all the duty of those who bear the office of watchmen.—The greater the insecurity and danger, the more needful the watchfulness.—Watchfulness the distinguishing characteristic of the true servants of Christ: 1. It is a tribute to the treasure, which is to be guarded; 2. it points to conflict with an enemy; 3. to the danger of the time of night; 4. to fidelity in waiting for the Lord.—The security of the world should arouse and keep effectually awake the servants of Christ. (*See* for more, below.)

INTRODUCTION.—*Starke:*—*Quesnel:* Many are very curious to know the time of the end of the world; but few are busy in preparing themselves for the end of their life.

Heubner:—Desolate, without the Divinity, lifeless and unblessed, is the temple which Christ has forsaken.—What value has the building of stone, if the Spirit of God builds up no spiritual edifice?—The external embellishments of the Old Testament Church pass away; the temple which the Spirit builds, abides.—Only the weak are blinded by vain, external grandeur.—Times of pregnant fate excite all minds, and make them intent upon extraordinary help (even Savonarola an example). The desolation of holy places, churches in war, are solemn and humbling remembrances of God,—judgments upon those who have not valued holy things.

FIRST CYCLE.—*Starke:*—*Quesnel:* The world is full of seducers: every one need be on his guard that he be not seduced, 2 John 7.—*Osiander:* Dreadful judgment, to be adherents of a false Christ, of false prophets; and thus to depend upon them for salvation, 2 Thess. ii. 11.—*Quesnel:* Bad sign it is, not to know a good shepherd. God often takes such an one away in righteous judgment, suffering a hireling to come in his stead.—The judgments of God begin at His own house, Acts ix. 16; 1 Pet. iv. 14.—*Osiander:* To suffer for the sake of the truth is a benefit, 1 Pet. ii. 19, 20.—*Cramer:* the Church of Christ cannot exist without offence, 1 Cor. xi. 19.—*Quesnel:* The mingling of good and bad dangerous, but necessary.—*Zeisius:* Many who in prosperous times are held good Christians, fall away in the time of persecution, Luke viii. 13.—Nothing can stay the spread of the gospel.

Lisco:—The great prosperity of the missionary cause in our days a sign of the times (ver. 14).—*Gerlach:* Instead of gratifying curiosity, Christ warns and exhorts.—All the predictions of Scripture are warnings and encouragements, exhortations, proceeding from one great central truth, but never mere fore-announcements of future events.—All these are the beginnings of woes.—The regeneration of the world Jesus likens to natural birth.—*Heubner:* Calmness of Christians amidst the convulsions of the world.—External revolutions pave the Lord's way: the hand of the Lord is in them all.—The time of persecution is a time of test and sifting.—No cross, no crown.

SECOND CYCLE (vers. 15-28, the Gospel for the 25th Sunday after Trinity).—*Starke:*—*Hedinger:* When God's angry judgments are begun, there is no more room for watchfulness or hope.—Pleasant places, and strong defences, are of no use when God's rebukes are sent: they must be forsaken.—*Zeisius:* The angry judgments of Heaven, once begun, cannot be hindered but abated.—Out of six troubles He will save thee, Job v. 19.—Shall not God deliver His own elect? Luke xviii. 7, 8.—*Cramer:* Christ is nowhere to be found but in the word and sacrament.—He who binds Christ and His kingdom to certain persons, places, times, and hours, is certainly by that token of the guild of the false prophets.—*Zeisius:* As a physical abomination was a certain sign of the desolation of Israel, so the spiritual abomination of Antichrist within the Church will be a certain sign of the advent of Christ, and of the end of the world, 2 Thess. ii. 3.—*Canstein:* The devil apes our Lord Christ.—*Osiander:* God keeps a strict and careful eye on His elect.—It is dangerous to trust men in things which pertain to salvation.

Gerlach:—The putrifying corpse of the world's and of the Church's organization, and finally of all humanity (!) upon earth.—*Heubner:* The tender and

compassionate heart of Jesus thinks of all the scenes of tribulation at the destruction of Jerusalem; especially of the pangs of maternity, of the anguish and helplessness of those with child, and those that give suck: comp. John xvi. 21. This should draw to Christ all hearts of mothers.—Christ's directions, and Christians' duty, in all times of general distress.

Westermeier:—How we must prepare ourselves beforehand for the day of judgment.—*Dräseke:* The days will be shortened to the elect.—*Rambach:* The goodness of God in the midst of His judgments.—*Reinhard:* That Christians must be confident when nothing, fearful when everything, depends upon them. —*Bachmann:* The deportment of true Christians in the advancing corruption of the times.

THIRD CYCLE (vers. 37–51, the Gospel for the 28th Sunday after Trinity).—*Starke:*—*Canstein:* As often as we look up to the clouds, we should remember the Lord and His coming; and thus keep His fear before our eyes.—*Osiander:* The pious, driven about in this world, will all be gathered together in the kingdom of heaven; not one of them will be left behind.—The day of death and of judgment concealed.—The more secure, the nearer the Judge.—*Cramer:* The more daring the blasphemers are in their riot and debauchery, the nearer the Lord.—A wise householder makes his house sure every night.—The uncertain day of his death is to every one his last day.—Fidelity is the most beautiful trait of the servants of God.—Fidelity and prudence go together.—Because hypocrites are of double heart, the decree in their punishment is that they shall be cut asunder.

Lisco:—The coming of the Son of Man will be as sudden and unexpected as the flood was. (Both predicted; both finding an unbelieving, careless generation, sunk in carnal security.)—Blessed results of watchfulness.—The necessity of perpetual readiness, exhibited in the fate of the unfaithful steward.

Heubner:—The earthly-minded fear the last day and the Lord's coming, as the miser fears the thief; to him the Lord is only a thief, robbing him of all that he has.—The duties and the recompense of the faithful servant.—The guilt and the punishment of the unfaithful servant.

Hossbach:—The true watchfulness and preparation of Christians for the coming of the Lord.—*Rambach:* On the obligation to prepare for death and judgment. — *W. Hoffmann* (*Maranatha*, 1857): The signs of the coming of Christ: 1. The hour of temptation; 2. the sufferings of the Church of Christ; 3. the power of the lie; 4. carnal security; 5. universal preaching of the gospel.

SECOND SECTION.

JUDGMENT ON THE RULERS OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER XXIV. 45–51.

(Luke xii. 35–46.—*The Gospel for the 27th Sunday after Trinity, vers. 37–51.*)

45 Who then is a [the, ὁ] faithful and wise servant, whom his[1] lord hath made ruler
[the lord set, κατέστησεν][2] over his household,[3] to give them meat [food, τὴν τροφήν] in
46 due season? Blessed *is* that servant, whom his lord when he cometh shall find so
47 doing. Verily I say unto you, That he shall make him ruler [set him] over all his
48 goods. But and if [But if, ἐὰν δὲ] that evil servant shall say in his heart, My lord de-
49 layeth his coming; And shall begin to smite [beat] *his* fellow servants, and to eat and
50 drink [and shall eat and drink][4] with the drunken; The lord of that servant shall [will]
come in a day when he looketh not for *him* [*it*], and in an hour that he is not aware of
51 [when he is not aware, ᾗ οὐ γινώσκει], And shall [will] cut him asunder, and appoint
him his portion with the hypocrites: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.

[1] Ver. 45.—Αὐτοῦ is missing in B., D., L., al., [Cod. Sinait.], and thrown out by Lachmann and Tischendorf.

[2] Ver. 45.—[Cod. Sinait. reads here: καταστήσει, *shall set*, for κατέστησεν. Anticipated from ver. 47.—P. S.]

[3] Ver. 45.—Lachmann and Tischendorf: οἰκετεία, following B., L., al. It likewise means *household, the body of servants*. But for internal reasons the *text. rec.:* θεραπεία, which has sufficient witnesses, is preferable. [Cod. Sinait. reads: οικιας.—P. S.]

[4] Ver. 49.—Codd. B., C., D., [and the critical editions], read: ἐσθίῃ δὲ καὶ πίνῃ [instead of the infinitives ἐσθίειν καὶ πίνειν, depending on ἄρξηται.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 45. **Who then is?**—That is, in conformity with the previous instructions. The Lord shows in a parable that the judgment will begin upon those in office in the Church. He shows the contrast between the faithful and the unfaithful servant, but dwelling finally upon the latter. The τίς is not instead of εἴ τις. According to Bengel and de Wette, it is encouraging: May every one be such a servant. According to Meyer, there is a change of construc-

tion: the characteristics of the servant ought to follow; but in the vivacity of the discourse the commendation and the characteristics go together. But the description of the servant which has gone before —faithful and wise—is in favor of de Wette.

Whom the lord hath made ruler.—This being appointed of the Lord has stress laid upon it in the case of the faithful servant. In the case of κακὸς δοῦλος ἐκεῖνος it is omitted, and the σύνδουλοι are made prominent.—**Over his household.**—We read θεραπεία, which makes it more definite that the office of rulership has for its end only to provide nourishment for the house. The office is the office of ruler, only so far as it actually imparts spiritual food in the office of teacher. Watching is here indicated in its concrete form, as fidelity to the calling. It is connected with faith, as not watching is connected with unbelief.

Ver. 47. **Verily I say unto you, . . . ruler over all.**—The description of the perfect κληρονομία. Comp. Rom. viii. 17.

Ver. 48. **But and if that evil servant shall say.**—The ἐκεῖνος is not only δεικτικῶς, but also prophetically significant. The faithful servant was hypothetically mentioned in the form of exhortation; the wicked servant is exhibited as a very definite form in the future, and brought near to present view. The evil conduct of the wicked servant springs from unbelief, which, however, in his official position, he can utter only in his heart. But his unbelief is specifically unbelief in regard to the coming of the Lord and His award.—**My lord delayeth.**—The expression marks an internal mocking frivolity. But his bad conduct is evidently exhibited in two aspects: first, as a despotic and proud bearing to his fellow-servants, whom he abuses instead of giving them nourishment; and secondly, as *laxity* of conduct toward the wicked members of the household and the uninvited guests, with whom he commits all kinds of riot and debauchery. Meyer: First, we have his conduct toward his fellow-servants, and then his conduct outside* the οἰκετεία; and, under the rule of such a steward, the household generally is to some extent given over to wickedness. Such a dissolute hospitality, also, is signified, as makes all drunkards from without welcome. The **fellow-servants** here must be understood of such as are faithful servants of their absent master.—The great historical contrast between the Inquisition and Indulgences will easily occur to the reader.

Ver. 51. **And cut him asunder: διχοτομήσει.**—The expression is so significant that Meyer properly holds fast the literal rendering, "to cut into two parts," and rejects all generalizing interpretations, such as scourging (Paulus, de Wette, etc.), mutilation (Michaelis), exclusion from service (Beza), and extreme punishment (Chrysostom). It is emphatically the punishment of the theocracy, cutting in two, sawing asunder,—1 Sam. xv. 33; 2 Sam. xii. 31 (Heb. xi. 37),—which here figuratively expresses a sudden and annihilating destruction, and possibly not without reference to the double-mindedness of the condemned, or even to the duplicity of the Anti-Christianity which will finally bring spiritual despotism to its doom (*see* Rev. xiii. 1 and 11).

With the hypocrites.—The further doom of the wicked servant after the judgment of the great day of Christ's coming. "Even the Rabbins send the hypocrites to Gehenna." The wicked servant is a hypocrite, not only because he thinks to present himself at last under the guise of fidelity, and must have showed false colors from the beginning (Meyer), but especially because, in his ill-treatment of the fellow-servants, he assumes the semblance of official zeal.

* [The Edinb. trsl. has just the reverse: *within*. The servants constitute the household, the guests are the outsiders.—P. S.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The parable of the good and wicked servants applies specially to the disciples, and with them to spiritual officers in the Church, although not without application to Christians generally. It is to be observed, that, according to Luke, Peter gave the Lord occasion to utter it. Yet the whole context shows that it belongs to the general eschatological instruction which we find in Matthew; that is, it naturally connects itself with the discourse concerning the last things, and opens the series of parables and declarations which introduce the judgment of the end of the world, the day that winds up the present age. This connection makes the contrast between the good and wicked servant more than a mere exhortation; it assumes a prophetic aspect, as indeed is seen in the definite expressions which pervade it.

2. In regard to the rulership of the two servants, it is observable that he who humbly serves his fellow-servants, faithfully giving them their food (the word and spiritual nourishment generally), is represented as being set over the household by his lord, and that it is promised that he should be set over all his lord's goods. But the wicked servant, who despotically set himself over the household and house, is not represented as having been appointed; in his supposed official correction of his subordinates, he appears to be a reckless injurer of his equal fellow-servants.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The faithful servant and the wicked servant in the Church: 1. Their opposite spirit: the one waits for the coming of the Lord, the other puts no faith in that coming. 2. Their acts: the one takes care of the household's nourishment, the other makes himself a despotic lord, who abuses the faithful, and wastes the goods of the house in riotous living. 3. Their recompense: blessed and miserable surprise at the advent of the Lord. The one is elevated to the highest dignity, the other is condemned and destroyed on the spot.—The faithful servant waits for his Lord, while he waits upon the Church with the Lord's word.—The contradiction in the life of the wicked servant: 1. In his spirit: mocking unbelief of the self-deception, which supposes that in his lord's long absence he must take the whole government, instead of the mere provision of food. 2. In his deportment: fearful *severity* against the better of the household; perfect *laxity* toward the wicked, and fellowship with their wickedness.—That servant who assumes the highest place in hypocrisy will encounter the sharpest doom.—The divided heart will be punished by a perfect dividing asunder of the life.—The great schism of the Greek and Latin Church, an earnest sign of judgment.—The great schisms in the Occidental, and in the Protestant Church, and their bearing upon the end of ecclesiasticism on earth.—The

twofold judgment over perfected unfaithfulness: 1. A sudden surprise; 2. an endless punishment.—The punishment of unfaithfulness in office the punishment of the hypocrite.

THIRD SECTION.

THE JUDGMENT UPON THE CHURCH ITSELF. SECOND PICTURE OF JUDGMENT.

CHAPTER XXV. 1–13.

(*The Gospel for the 27th Sunday after Trinity.*)

1 Then shall the kingdom of heaven be likened unto ten virgins, which [who] took
2 their [own][1] lamps, and went forth to meet the bridegroom.[2] And five of them were
3 wise [foolish], and five *were* foolish [wise].[3] They that *were* foolish[4] took their lamps,
4 and took no oil with them: But the wise took oil in their [the][5] vessels with their
5 lamps. While the bridegroom tarried, they all slumbered [nodded, ἐνύσταξαν] and
6 slept [fell asleep, ἐκάθευδον]. And at midnight there was a cry [a cry was] made, Be-
7 hold, the bridegroom cometh;[6] go ye out to meet him. Then all those virgins arose,
8 and trimmed [adorned, ἐκόσμησαν] their [own, ἑαυτῶν] lamps. And the foolish said
unto the wise, Give us of your oil; for our lamps are gone out [going out, σβέννυνται].[7]
9 But the wise answered, saying, *Not so* [Not so, μήποτε·];[8] lest there be not [there will
not be, οὐ μή][9] enough for us and you: but go ye rather to them that sell, and buy for
10 yourselves. And while they went to buy, the bridegroom came; and they that were ready
11 went in with him to the marriage: and the door was shut. Afterward came also the
other virgins [the rest of the virgins, αἱ λοιπαὶ παρθένοι], saying, Lord, Lord, open to us.
12, 13 But he answered and said, Verily I say unto you, I know you not. Watch there-
fore; for ye know neither [not, οὐκ] the day nor the hour wherein the Son of man
cometh.[10]

[1] Ver. 1.—[The best ancient authorities and the critical editions read: ἑαυτῶν, for the *text. rec.*: αὐτῶν, in vers. 1 and 7. Dr. Lange also adopts it in his German Version; while Dr. Conant overlooks this difference of reading.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 1.—The addition: καὶ τῆς νύμφης (*et sponsæ*), is poorly attested and disturbs the sense. [TRENCH, *Notes on the Parables*, p. 237, thinks otherwise, and approves, as to sense, the reading: *and went forth to meet the bridegroom* AND THE BRIDE. Maldonatus likewise favors it *propter veteres interpretes*. It was the custom among the Jews and Greeks that the bridegroom, accompanied by his friends, went to the house of the bride, to lead her to his own home, and was joined by the virgins, the friends of the bride, not on his going to fetch the bride, but on his returning, with her, to his own house. A similar custom seems to prevail in Sicily even to this day. Comp. HUGHES, *Travels in Sicily*, vol. ii. p. 20 (quoted by Trench): "We went to view the nocturnal procession which always accompanies the bridegroom in escorting his betrothed spouse from the paternal roof to that of her future husband. This consisted of nearly one hundred of the first persons in Joannina, with a great crowd of torch-bearers, and a band of music. *After having received the lady* they returned, but were joined by an equal number of ladies, who paid this compliment to the bride." These ladies, Trench thinks, correspond to the virgins here, and join the procession on the *return* of the bridegroom, with the bride, to his own and her new home. Other commentators, however, among them Lange, assume here a modification of the usual custom, and a procession of the virgins to meet the bridegroom on his way to the house of the bride. *See* the *Exeg. Notes*. —P. S.]

[3] Ver. 2.—Codd. B., C., D., L., Z., Lachmann, Tischendorf, put μωραί first. [So does Cod. Sinait., and Alford. Conant ignores this difference in the position of μωραί and φρόνιμοι.—P. S.]

[4] Ver. 3.—The readings: αἱ γάρ [*text. rec.*: αἵτινες],—αἱ δέ, αἱ οὖν appear to be interpretations. [Tischendorf, de Wette, and Meyer regard αἱ γάρ as an emendation of αἵτινες. But Codd. B., C., L., and Sinait. sustain αἱ γάρ, and it is more natural to suppose, with Alford, that δέ, οὖν, καί, αἵτινες were substituted because γάρ was not understood.—P. S.]

[5] Ver. 4.—[The *text. rec.* inserts αὐτῶν, or αὑτῶν, after ἀγγείοις, but it is wanting in Codd. Sinait., B., D., L., and omitted by Lachmann and Alford, while Tischendorf reads αὑτῶν. Lange retains it, but in parenthesis and in small type. —P. S.]

[6] Ver. 6.—The word: ἔρχεται (*cometh*), is omitted by Lachmann and Tischendorf, according to decisive authorities. [*See* also Tregelles and Alford. Conant, simply: *Behold, the bridegroom!*—P. S.]

[7] Ver. 7.—[Alford emphasizes the present tense, and finds in it the important truth, that the lamps of the foolish virgins were *not extinguished altogether*.—P. S.]

[8] Ver. 9.—[*Not so* is italicised in the English Version as an interpolation, because it follows the *text. rec.*: μήποτε οὐκ ἀρκέσῃ, and makes ἀρκέσῃ depend upon μήποτε. But the correct reading, according to the best critical authorities, is: μήποτε· οὐ μὴ ἀρκέσῃ, and μήποτε is to be taken as an independent exclamation: *By no means! Not so! There will not be enough*, etc. Meyer: *Nimmermehr; es wird gewisslich nicht hinreichen!* Lange: *Mit nichten! Es würde sicher nicht ausreichen.*—P. S.]

[9] Ver. 9.—Read οὐ μή [for οὐκ without μή] according to B., C., D., Lachmann, Tischendorf, [Tregelles, Alford].

[10] Ver. 13.—The words: *wherein the Son of Man cometh*, are wanting in Codd. A., B., C., D., [Cod. Sinait.], in Lachmann and Tischendorf; [also in the text of Tregelles and Alford, and the revised translation of Matthew by Conant and the N. T. of the Am. Bible Union.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1. **Then shall be likened.**—Fritzsche rightly notes a hint of sequence in the *τότε*. After the judgment upon the servants and the office, follows the judgment upon the people generally.* The figure introduces females, in conformity with the idea of the Church.

Ten virgins.—*Ten*, the number of developed secular life; and thus the number of the completed secular development of the Church. It was termed by the Rabbins the "all-comprehending number." What goes beyond ten returns to units again. Hence the ten commandments, the harp with its ten strings,† the ten Sephiroth of the Cabbalists, etc.‡ (Comp. NORK: *Etymologisch-symbolisch-mythologisches Realwörterbuch*, sub *Zehn*.) *Five*, the number of freedom as half-consummation, and of the course of the world in motion: hence also the number of punishment or compensation, Exod. xxii. 1 (five senses, five fingers, etc.); compare Luke xix. 19. The *virgins* are not merely companions of the bride, but representatives of the bride, the Church.§ *See* the prophetical type in 2 Cor. xi. 2; Rev. xiv. 4. Virginity signifies Christianity as separation from the world, as restraint from all worldly contamination. *See* Ezek. xxiii; Hos. i.; Rev. xvii.; comp. ch. xiv. 4.‖ Concerning the relation of the virgins to the bride, we must bear in mind the analogy of the marriage supper of the king's son and his guests. The Church, in her aggregate and ideal unity, is the bride; the members of the Church, as individually called, are guests; in their separation from the world, and expectation of the Lord's coming, they are His virgins. Virginity, waiting for the Lord, and festal joy, they share with the bride. Bengel, in his *Discourses on the Revelation* (p. 1039), distinguishes between such Christians as belong to the bride and such as belong only to the number of guests. This is so far true, as the perfect experience of Christianity finds its proper centre only in the elect. But we are not authorized to make a full separation between the two, but must assume a gradual rising.

Their own lamps.—A feature of the custom which is significant. Propriety, individuality, preparation, independence of others. Vocation to a peculiar and personal spiritual life. There was a kind of torch amongst the ancients, which consisted of a long, thick wooden staff, in the upper end of which a vessel was inserted, having a wick sustained by oil: thus they were at once lamps and torches. [Alford on the contrary: These were not torches or wicks fastened on staves, but properly *lamps*, and the oil vessels (which is most important to the parable) were *separate* from the lamps; the lamps being the hearts lit with the flame of heavenly love and patience, supplied with the oil of the Spirit.—P. S.]

And went forth.—"Here the customs of a solemn bridal procession in the night are presupposed. 1 Macc. ix. 37 gives us an example of such a procession in daylight. Among the Greeks and Romans, the bride was brought home by night: hence the torches of which so much is said. Comp. R. Salomo, *ad Chelim*, ii. 8 (*see* Wetstein and Lightfoot) witnesses the same practice in Palestine. Ordinarily, the bride was fetched by the bridegroom and his friends (*domum ducere*); but here it is the office of the virgins (comp. Ps. xlv. 15, Grotius) to fetch the bridegroom, and the wedding seems to take place in the house of the bride, as in Judg. xiv. 10." De Wette. Similarly Meyer. The figure generally is modified by the circumstance, that the bridegroom comes from afar, as in Judg. xiv. This brings in the festal going forth to meet him, in which the virgins represent the bride; it also indicates the long tarrying of the bridegroom; and finally, though less markedly, that the marriage takes place in the house of the bride. Compare the art. *Hochzeit* in WINER'S *Bibl. Realwörterbuch* [and the art. *Marriage* in SMITH'S *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. ii. p. 240 sqq.]

Ver. 3. **They that were foolish took their lamps.**—We must carefully note the contrast: In the case of the foolish virgins, the taking of the lamps is everything (λαβοῦσαι τὰς λαμπάδας ἑαυτῶν); but in the case of the wise, it is the taking of oil in their vessels. The foolish are thus represented as being vain and thoughtless, looking only at appearances, and only in haste going forth through excited feeling.

Ver. 5. **While the bridegroom tarried.**—Meyer supposes that the virgins had set forth from the house of the bride, and had gone into another house by the way. This strange notion is needless, when it is considered that the virgins secretly provide their own lamps, and then betake themselves to the bride's house. The ἐξῆλθον of ver. 1 does not mean that they had already gone forth some distance on the way: it is a preliminary description of the great

* [Millennarian interpreters refer the *then*, and the whole section from ch. xxiv. to xxv. 30 to Christ's coming before the millennium, or the judgment which precedes His personal reign on earth, as distinct from His final coming.—P. S.]

† [The Edinb. trsl. not knowing the difference between *Saiten* (*string*) and *Seiten* (*side, page*), renders Lange's "*Psalter* [*i. e.*, ψαλτήριον, the stringed instrument, or ψαλτήρ, which also means sometimes the instrument, though more frequently the performer, the harper] *mit* 10 *Saiten*:" "*the Psalter with its ten leaves!*" According to Joseph. *Antiq.* vii. 12, 3, the Jewish harp, כִּנּוֹר, like the Greek κινύρα, the Latin *cithara* (hence *guitar*), had ten strings. To this the original no doubt refers.—P. S.]

‡ [Ten formed a company with the Jews, also a family to eat the passover; ten Jews living in one place formed a congregation and should be provided with a synagogue; ten lamps or torches were the usual number in marriage processions. *See* WETSTEIN *in loc.*, VITRINGA: *de Synagoga*, p. 232 sq., and on the biblical symbolism of numbers the remarks in this volume, p. 183 sq.—Tertullian (*De anima*, c. 18) ascribes to some of the Gnostics a curious mystic interpretation of the ten virgins: the five foolish virgins signify the five senses which are easily deceived and often misled, the five wise virgins are the reasonable powers which are able to comprehend ideas. Jerome, Augustine, Gregory, and Beda, on the contrary, refer the number ten to the five senses under two aspects, viz.: in their right use and in their abuse. On this Maldonatus makes the remark: "*Probabilia hæc sunt* [?]; *sed potius credo, propterea denario numero parabolam fuisse propopitam, ut omnium hominum multitudo atque universitas significetur, quæ per hunc numerum declarari solet.*"—P. S.]

§ [According to the millennarian theory the bride is the restored Jewish Church and the ten virgins represent the Gentile congregations accompanying her. Alford is inclined to take a similar view: "In both the wedding parables (*see* ch. xxii.) the *bride* does not appear, for she, being the church, is in fact the aggregate of the guests in the one case, and of the companions in the other [so Lange, *see* above]. We may perhaps say, that she is here, in the strict interpretation, the *Jewish Church* and these ten virgins *Gentile* congregations accompanying her."—P. S.]

‖ [Chrysostom, Theophylact, Euthymius Zig., and Gregory, also Augustine in one place (but differently in another), are certainly wrong in taking *virgins* in the literal sense, and every other trait of the parable in a figurative sense. This contracted view (as even Maldonatus admits it to be) is closely connected with the ascetic overestimate of celibacy. Hilary, on the other hand, expands the meaning of *virgins* so as to comprehend *omnes homines, fideles et infideles*. Origen, Jerome, and Maldonatus justly limit the title to all believers.—P. S.]

event of the parable.—**They all nodded and fell asleep.**—An intimation of weakness indeed, yet expressing the great delay of the bridegroom rather than censure.* Certainly the slumbering was perilous, since it took away the possibility of repairing, in haste, the lack of oil. [NAST: The expression denotes the gradual approach of sleep to such as occupy a sitting posture, and strive at first to withstand the disposition to slumber. These virgins made efforts to keep awake, but finally yielded to the influence of sleep. ALFORD: Being weak by nature, they gave way to drowsiness; as indeed the wakefulness of the holiest Christian, compared with what it should be, is a sort of slumber. D. BROWN: Two stages of spiritual declension—first, that half-involuntary lethargy or drowsiness which is apt to steal over one who falls into inactivity; and then a conscious yielding to it after a little vain resistance.—P. S.]

Ver. 6. **At midnight.**—Significant. The most unfit time to obtain what they had omitted.—**A cry was made.**—The greater the apparent delay, the more intense the surprise at the cry of the heralds sent forward.

Ver. 7. **Adorned their own lamps.**—The trimming† had probably taken place before. The adornment of the lamp was the kindled festal flame, in the light of which it shone. Hence, afterward, extinction is spoken of at once, σβέννυνται: they burn dimly, and will go out.‡

Ver. 9. **Not so!**—Since οὐ μή is the correct reading in the following clause, μήποτε is not dependent on ἀρκέσῃ, but has the force of a strongly repelling negative: *By no means!*

Ver. 10. **They that were ready went in with him.**—It is presupposed that they first went out to meet him with their festal lamps. It is not needful to explain, with Bornemann, "into the house of the bridegroom;" nor, with Meyer, to suppose that they had gone back from the imaginary midway house to that of the bride.

Ver. 12. **I know you not.**—*See* ch. vii. 23, p. 145. [Here = *Non agnosco, I do not acknowledge you as mine.* This as well as the ἐκλείσθη ἡ θύρα, bears rather strongly against the view of Olshausen, Alford, and others, who suppose that the foolish virgins were only excluded from the millennium, but not from the ultimate kingdom of glory in heaven. (*See* below, *Doctrinal Thoughts*, No. 5.) Alford tries to evade the difficulty by making an essential distinction, which is hardly justified, between οὐκ οἶδα ὑμᾶς in this passage, and οὐδέποτε ἔγνων ὑμᾶς in ch. vii. 23.—P. S.]

Vers. 1–12. THE MEANING OF THE PARABLE.—The leading idea is the readiness of the Church for the coming of the Lord: but that rather viewed internally than externally; not in its *extension*, but in its *intensity*.* The Lord had made it very clear that the question was not of a mechanical millennarian preparation; for He represented all the virgins as asleep, the wise in common with the foolish. Internal preparation is before all things dependent on the possession of the oil. The *oil* signifies the anointing of the Holy Spirit, which de Wette denies in vain. This explanation is founded upon the constant typical meaning of the oil in the Old and New Testaments. *See* Heb. i. 9; comp. Ps. xlv. 7, 8; Acts x. 38. The name of the Messiah shows that the oil of unction was a symbol of the anointing of the Holy Spirit. But the oil which fed the lamps could have no other meaning; for even the olive-tree partook of the same significance. *See* Zech. iv. 2, 3; Rev. xi. 4. Now, if the oil signifies the true inward life of faith, the spiritual life, the interpretation of the *lamps* is not far off: they denote the *form* of faith.† Hence it is significant that the foolish virgins were very careful to secure their lamps, but neglected the oil; while the wise virgins took oil in their vessels with their lamps. They did not neglect the lamps, but their chief concern was about the oil. Olshausen gives the right interpretation of the oil; but he improperly makes the lamp mean the heart;‡ observing that in the foolish virgins faith had its root only in the feeling. Chrysostom gives an arbitrary explanation: with him the oil is alms; and so on with the rest of the particulars. Luther inversely makes the lamps good works, and the oil-vessels faith. Meyer is against all interpretation of the details, and appeals to Calvin: "*Multum se torquent quidam in lucernis, in vasis, in oleo. Atqui simplex et genuina summa est, non sufficere alacre exigui temporis studium, nisi infatigabilis constantia simul accedat.*" But in this constancy, externally regarded, the foolish virgins are not by any means wanting. They pray, they even

* [Lange: *Andeutung der Schwachheit freilich, sonst aber mehr die grosse Verspätung des Bräutigams als einen bestimmteren Tadel aussprechend.* The Edinb. edition misunderstands this passage entirely in translating: "*but also declaring their more express fault to have been the retarding of the bridegroom.*"—P. S.]

† [Not: "*the personal festal array,*" as the Edinb. trsl. renders: *Das Aufputzen.* Dr. Lange no doubt refers to the preparation of the lamps by pouring on fresh oil, and removing the fungi about the wick, which was done by a sharp-pointed wire attached to the lamp (as still seen in ancient bronze lamps in sepulchres). He translates ἐκόσμησαν (which the English Version renders *trimmed*) literally: sie *schmückten.*—P. S.]

‡ [Alford emphasizes the present tense: *they are going out.* *See* the Crit. Note above. The English Version certainly conveys a false sense, and it is surprising that such a scholar as Dr. Wordsworth should base an interpretation on a false translation, when he remarks to σβέννυνται: "*i. e.*, they had died in a careless unprofitable condition, and these lamps were *gone out*, and now it was too late to ask for oil."—The foolish virgins still had the outward appearance and profession of Christianity, but in its last stage of consumption.—P. S.]

* [Calvin and Alford put the lesson of the parable in *the blessedness of endurance unto the end.* But Lange is right, as appears from ver. 13 which contains the lesson of the parable, as Maldonatus correctly observes.—P. S.]

† [Here lies the principal difference between the Roman Catholic and the Protestant Evangelical interpretation of the parable of the Ten Virgins,—a difference which is similar to that concerning the Wedding Garment, ch. xxii. 11. Origen, Hilary, Jerome, Maldonatus, and many Catholic interpreters (including Quesnel, the Jansenist), make the *oil* the symbol of good works or charity, without which faith is dead and hence cannot burn (James ii. 26), and the *lamps* the symbol of faith, which was common to all virgins. It is only a modification of this exposition if Chrysostom, Ambrose, and other fathers refer the oil more particularly to *eleemosyna et misericordia.* The reformers and most of the Protestant commentators, on the contrary, more naturally understand the *oil* to signify the principle of a living faith, or the unction of the Holy Spirit, or more generally: inward spiritual life, the grace of God in the heart, and the *lamps*, the outward Christian appearance and profession (Luther, less aptly: good works). The fathers, however, can hardly be quoted as a whole in favor of the Roman interpretation, since they differ very widely in their exposition and explication. Thus the *lamps* mean, according to Hilary, the human bodies, in which the divine light burns; according to Jerome, the senses of the body. Augustine, who varies in his interpretations of this parable, in one place approaches the Protestant view, when he makes the oil to mean *bonam intentionem mentis*, and the lamps *bona opera* (*Ep.* cxl. 33; *Serm.* cxlix. 11). If we are authorized to press every feature in this parable, and to make it, as it were, (*sit venia verbo!*) to walk on all fours, the exposition of Dr. Lange is the most ingenious and plausible.—P. S.]

‡ [So also Quesnel and Alford.—P. S.]

run in the very midnight to the sellers. It would be out of the question to suppose that even, after all, they obtained a supply, and came with their oil after the rest. This is not in the parable; and the simple point remains, that they troubled themselves about the oil too late. The division of the virgins into two classes must therefore have this meaning, that one part of the Church is living, while the other lives only *in* appearance, because it lives only *to* appearance. Hence the distribution into two halves must not be literally pressed. *Midnight* is a late and dark season, a season of sleep and the danger of surprise. "The ancient Church took the word literally; and hence the origin of the *vigiliæ*." Heubner. The *cry* at midnight cannot refer to the ecclesiastical watchers exclusively; but, in connection with them, to the cosmical signs of the *parousia* which have been already mentioned. The *sellers* have been interpreted of the Holy Scripture and its writers.* The means of grace generally, or prayer, will obviously be thought of; but this is a trait in the parable which scarcely endures interpretation. The *sleeping* of the virgins was very inappropriately referred by Chrysostom to their bodily death; † and by Calvin to "*occupationum hujus mundi distractio.*" But it seems best to understand it of an involuntary entanglement in the world and its spirit of carnal security,‡ to which even believing Christians are liable. Heubner: "The sleepiness is not the relaxation or decline of Christianity,§ but the remission of a definite expectation of the near approach of Christ's coming. We can easily understand how this expectation has decreased with increasing ages; it is not found now among all faithful Christians, of whom very few can bring themselves to think that *we* may live to see the last day. But this sleepiness does not exclude the general preparation of Christians in other respects, that is, their faith and love."

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *The Judgment on the Church.*—The ten virgins signify not merely a part of the Church, as Olshausen contends for, but the whole of it. This is evident, first, from the number ten, which points to the perfect secular development of the Church. Further, the circumstance that individual traits are not at all exhibited; the five virgins on the one side, and the five virgins on the other, being altogether alike respectively. And, lastly, the position of this parable between that of the two servants and that which follows concerning the entrusted talents; that is, between the judgment upon the ministerial office, and the judgment upon individual Christians.

2. *The Significance of the Individual Traits of the Parable.*—The three most essential points are: 1. The ten virgins; 2. the delay of the bridegroom, and the midnight; 3. the oil in the vessels in relation to the lamps. Of the first we have spoken already. As it regards the second, the two great things—the delay of the bridegroom, and midnight—coalesce in one, the second being the consequence of the first. The midnights in the history of the kingdom of God, are each the last late season of a slowly-expiring age. Hence, the time of the last kings of Israel, before the Lord's coming in the Babylonian captivity, or in the Messianic prophecies; still more, the time of the crucifixion of Christ; the end of the Middle Ages; and especially the final period before the end of the world. It is midnight for the Church of Christ, when the worldly spirit is so far in the ascendency as to make it seem that the history of the Church will fall into the common course of the world and of nature, that the kingdom of heaven is not to be consummated in the judgment and renewal of the world, and that Christ is not to come or to return. In such a season the faithful are more than ever tempted to give up the feeling, that they live in the midst of the great preparation for the marriage supper, and the Christian glorification of the world; and gradually to surrender their firm hold on their vocation, which is to represent the solemn festive character* of the work of Christ. But more than once has arisen, in the midnights of Christian history, the cry, *the Bridegroom cometh!* The cry without doubt must signify, in such cases, the prophetic warnings of faithful watchmen, in connection with the solemn signs of the times, which likewise preach. Heavy judgments and great awakenings testify the nearness of the Lord, until He really come. In such times the Church is sifted.

3. And the decisive test is not the lamp, but the oil-vessel,—the Spirit, the spiritual life.

4. But, as the wicked and the faithful servants are sundered, and the wicked are cut in two, so will the Church through that sifting be divided into a dying and a living portion. "This distinction is always present. But as time runs on it becomes more manifest; and at the end it will be seen in all its fearfulness, as the ground of the judgment which the Church must undergo. They all have the lamps: the forms of faith, ecclesiastical confession and position. But then the question comes as to whether the form is filled with the eternal substance of the Spirit of Christ. The foolish virgins lack the Spirit of Christ; they have no lights, no evidences of love, no hymns of praise to welcome the Lord in His coming." (From the author's *Leben Jesu.*)

5. According to Olshausen, this judgment is only preparatory, only an exclusion from the marriage of the Lamb (Rev. xix. 7).† But what else is the mar-

* [So Olshausen. Somewhat differently Alford: *οἱ πωλοῦντες* are the ordinary dispensers of the means of grace (which he thinks supplies no mean argument for a *set* and *appointed*, and moreover a *paid* ministry; for if they *sell*, they *receive* for the thing sold). Better with Lange: the means of grace themselves (including the Scriptures and the ministry). This is certainly a far more sensible interpretation than that of Chrysostom, Hilary, and other fathers, who take the sellers of oil to signify the *poor*, who receive the *alms* (the oil) of the faithful, and sell the oil in return for the relief afforded to their wants!—P. S.]

† [So also Basil, Hilary, and Augustine, as well as Wordsworth and other modern commentators. This exposition would imply that at the time of the Lord's coming none of the faithful would be living on earth. Trench, on the other hand, regards the *falling asleep* merely as a circumstance required by the convenience of the parabolic narration, and Nast is inclined to the same view. But the exposition of Lange (*see* above, comp. also Stier and Heubner) is the most plausible.—P. S.]

‡ [In German: *Sicherheit*, *security*, not *severity*, as the Edinb. transl. reads.]

§ [In German: *Das Schläfrigwerden ist nicht Erschlaffen* (relaxation, abatement) *des Christenthums;* in the Edinb. trsl.: *the profound sleep of Christendom* (which would require in German: *der tiefe Schlaf der Christenheit*).—P. S.]

* [In German: *die Festlichkeit* (a favorite term with Dr. Lange), which the Edinb. trsl. mistook for *Festigkeit* and rendered: *stability!*—P. S.]

† [Similarly ALFORD: "We are not told that they could not buy—that the shops were shut—but simply that it was too late—*for that time.* For it is not the final coming of the Lord to judgment, when the day of grace will be past, that is spoken of.—except in so far as it is hinted at in the background."—Poiret (as quoted by Trench, p. 287), Fr. von Meyer, and millennarian commentators, take the same view,

riage of the Lamb, but the festival, or at least the fore-festival, of eternal blessedness? Olshausen thinks that the foolish virgins had faith (κύριε, κύριε, ver. 11), and that they lacked only sanctification. But they are without the Spirit, and therefore without the reality of faith. The saying: "Lord, Lord," saves not in the judgment. Only this much may be admitted, that this parable, like the preceding and the following, primarily delineates a historical judgment which introduces the final one, but is not the final and conclusive one itself. These three preliminary judgments, however, are introductory to the final judgment; and they are themselves so far final and decisive, as the want of the Spirit (oil), consummated unfaithfulness in office, and the squandering of the gifts of grace, fit the soul for condemnation. Only with reference to the possibility of individual conversions must a distinction be allowed between the preliminary judgments and the last end.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The judgment of the Church.—1. The impending coming of the Bridegroom to the marriage; 2. the five foolish and the five wise virgins; 3. the delay of the Bridegroom, and the midnight; 4. the cry at midnight; 5. the want of oil, and the lamps going out; 6. the feast of the wise, and the exclusion of the foolish virgins.—What is the great essential for the Church, waiting for the Lord? 1. The vessel of oil *with* the lamps: the spiritual life and the form of faith. 2. The oil *before* the lamps: the spiritual life above the form of faith. 3. The *oil* in the vessel: the anointing of the Holy Spirit in the confession.—The Church always divided into foolish and wise members.—The characteristics of the foolish virgins: 1. Hasty external equipment for the feast, which takes care of the appearance (the lamps), but forgets the essence (the oil). 2. Relaxation and drowsiness after the first excitement, affecting even the wise also. 3. False and anxious efforts at last, to repair the irreparable loss of spiritual life.—The characteristics of the wise virgins: 1. Divine preparation for eternity: the oil and the lamps. 2. Human infirmity in the course of life (slumbering). 3. Christian conduct in every hour of decision: burning lamps; refusal of ruinous fellowship with the unprovided.—Comparison of the wise and foolish virgins: 1. The prevailing similarity in externals; 2. the unapparent and yet decisive difference in secret.—The judgments of the Lord, especially the last, make a severance between the dead and the living members of the Church.—The severe test which the Church sustains, through the increase of worldliness and the apparent delay of the Lord.—The midnight in the history of the Church.—The cry at midnight: The Bridegroom cometh!—Joyful expectation of the advent, the burning festal lamp with which the Christian goes to meet the Lord.—The right preparation for His coming.—The hour of judgment makes the internal difference between living Christians and hypocrites apparent. 1. The former find themselves prepared with the great essential, which the others lack,—the Spirit, and spiritual fellowship with the Lord. 2. The former lift up their heads, because their redemption draws nigh; the others are overwhelmed and abandoned. 3. The former advance toward their Lord with the festal light of joy and praise; the others seek their help apart from Him.—The seemingly severe word of the wise virgins, a word of truth and gentleness. For, 1. The spiritual life, which makes Christians what they are, cannot be externally transmitted, but must be internally experienced; 2. it cannot be divided and diminished without perishing; 3. every attempt of the wise to have fellowship with the foolish in the hour of judgment, must be destructive to both parties alike; 4. if salvation were yet possible, it would be only in the ordinary way of repentance and conversion.—Ruinous delay for the Lord's feast.—What should be the effect of the Lord's sacred delay: not a hurtful delay in caring for what is needful, but a saving diligence.—The highest internal life is the most extreme watchfulness.

Starke:—Zeisius: The visible Church of Christ upon earth consists of true and false, dead and living, members,—of wise and foolish Christians.—The Church is divided into two halves: the true and the hypocritical.—The externals of Christianity are nothing before God, where the heart is not truly sanctified through the Holy Spirit.—The slumbering must be explained with a difference. With the ungodly, it is a godless security: with the faithful, it is a spiritual lethargy; which, however, is consistent with true love to Christ.—*Canstein:* The tarrying of the Bridegroom is not delay; but a pausing, in merciful desire to save.—Christ will come at a time when the Church is secure and asleep.—*Quesnel:* The pious are reputed fools and miserable; but the time will come when men will wish to be sharers of their goods and blessedness.—Every man must live by his own faith.—The sacred oil of joy may be bought without money, but it must be in time.—*Cramer:* Let him who would repent, take it in good season.—The Lord knoweth his own, 2 Tim. ii. 19.—Spiritual watchfulness is most needful.

Gossner:—The same judgment will come upon all Christians, who hold only to the form of religion (the lamps) without caring for the spirit (the oil in the lamps).

Gerlach:—Every soul is accepted for himself, and cannot represent others in judgment.*—Jesus knows those only for His own who have lived and persevered in living fellowship with Him.

Heubner:—To be a virgin, is the destination of a Christian: he is called to purity, sanctification, abstinence from spiritual whoredom, idolatry.—He is consecrated to the Lord.—Not all who have externally left Babylon, or the world, are true virgins.—Christ does not speak of unbelievers, but of those who once had faith.—Perfect unbelievers, who are without any expectation of the Lord, belong to neither class† of virgins.—Expectation of the Lord's advent a necessary mark of the Christian.—The lamp is the external form, the vessel for inward Christianity.—Without the lamp the oil is wasted, but without the oil the

and generally assume that the five foolish virgins will be excluded only from the blessedness of the first resurrection and the thousand years' reign of Christ on earth, but not from final salvation and the glory of heaven. It may be urged in favor of this view that the virgins are not divided into *good* and *bad*, but into *wise* and *foolish* virgins, and that the latter are not represented as unbelievers. But compare against this interpretation the remarks of Dr. Lange above, and also Dr. Nast on ver. 12, and the passage from Bengel quoted there.—P. S.]

* [Comp. the remark of Jerome on ver. 9: "*Unus quisque pro operibus suis mercedem recipiet, neque poterunt in die judicii aliorum virtutes aliorum vitia sublevare.*"—P. S.]

† [In German: *zu keiner Klasse;* in the Edinb. trl. *to one class*, which must be a mere printing error.—P. S.]

lamp will not burn.—Take care not to despise external Christianity (baptism, confession, church-going, partaking of the holy communion); but take care also not to be satisfied with it, and to rest upon it.—The two olive-trees, Rev. xi. 1–6.—True Christians unite both external and internal Christianity.—The extinction of the lamps, the painful feeling of emptiness in the spirit.—Hence the anguish and despondency of so many dying people.—How many send for the minister, and frantically desire spiritual good, when too late!

Fritsch: The constant preparation for death.—*Schenkel:* The false security of the converted.—*Lisco:* The parable an exhortation to true preparation for the end.

[Quesnel (in addition to those extracts given by Starke above):—Man's life is one continual preparation for the marriage-supper of eternity. His heart is his lamp. [So also Olshausen and Alford, but not Lange, *see* above.] By the motions and desires of his soul, he goes forth to meet the bridegroom, and hastens toward heaven by the virgin purity of his life.—The Church, before the marriage-supper of eternity, is always divided and mixed.—True wisdom consists in being always ready, and in constant remembrance of the bridegroom's coming.—A heart without charity [faith] is a lamp without oil.—The holiness of others will not avail us at the hour of death.—*The door is shut!* Dreadful and fatal words! No hope remains. Nothing but death shuts this door; but death may surprise us in our sins, and then despair is our portion.—*To watch* is to employ ourselves chiefly about the business of our salvation. But, alas, how many who slumber! How many asleep! How many seized with lethargy! How many quite dead!—Burkitt:—Some Christians, like foolish virgins, content themselves with a blazing lamp of an outward profession, without securing an inward principle of grace and love, which should maintain that profession, as the oil maintains the lamp. Hence the true wisdom consists in taking care that the vessel of his heart may be furnished with the graces of the Holy Spirit, as a prevailing and abiding principle.—The Bridegroom will certainly come, though at His own time: 1. Reason says: He may come (God is just and will reward, etc.); 2. faith says: He will come; 3. happy are those who go forth to meet Him.—The lamp of profession will certainly go out, which has not a stock of grace to feed it.—Those who would have grace, must have timely recourse *to them that sell, i. e.*, to the ordinances and means of grace.—The door is shut against them: the door of repentance; the door of hope; the door of salvation; shut for ever; shut by Him *that shutteth and none can open.*—Nast:—Three great evils fell upon the unwise virgins: 1. Their labor was lost, all the preparations they had made, the lamps which they had purchased, the amount of oil consumed, the cold, dark hours of watching; 2. the opportunity of redress; 3. their hope was lost for ever.—P. S.]

FOURTH SECTION.

THE FINAL JUDGMENT AS RETRIBUTION ON INDIVIDUALS. THIRD PICTURE OF THE JUDGMENT. [THE PARABLE OF THE TALENTS.]

Chapter XXV. 14–30.

14 For *the kingdom of heaven is* [he is][1] as a man travelling into a far country [going
abroad, ἀνθρ. ἀποδημῶν], *who* [. He] called his own servants, and delivered unto them
15 his goods. And unto one he gave five talents, to another two, and to another one; to
every man according to his several ability [his own ability, κατὰ τὴν ἰδίαν δύναμιν]; and
16 straightway took his journey [he went abroad, ἀπεδήμησεν]. Then he that had received the five talents went and traded with the same [with them, ἐν αὐτοῖς], and made *them*
17 [gained][2] other five talents. And likewise [Likewise also, Ὡσαύτως καί] he that *had*
18 *received* two [the two, ὁ τὰ δύο],[3] he also gained other two. But he that had received
19 one [talent][4] went and digged [dug] in the earth, and hid[5] his lord's money. After a
20 long time the lord of those servants cometh, and reckoneth with them. And so he that
had received [the] five talents came and brought other five talents, saying, Lord, thou
deliveredst unto me five talents: behold, I have gained beside them[6] five talents more
21 [other five talents beside them, ἄλλα πέντε τάλ. ἐκέρδησα ἐπ' αὐτοῖς]. His lord said
unto him, Well done, *thou*[7] good and faithful servant: thou hast been faithful over a
few things, I will make thee ruler over many things:[8] enter thou into the joy of thy
22 lord. [And] He also that had received [the] two talents came and said, Lord, thou deliveredst unto me two talents: behold, I have gained two other talents beside them.
23 His lord said unto him, Well done, good and faithful servant; thou hast been faithful
over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things:[9] enter thou into the joy
24 of thy lord. Then he which [who] had received the one talent came and said, Lord, I

knew thee that thou art a hard man, reaping where thou hast not sown, and gathering
25 where thou hast not strewed:[10] And I was afraid, and went and hid thy talent in the
26 earth: lo, *there* thou hast *that is* thine [thou hast thine own, ἔχεις τὸ σόν]. [And] His
lord answered and said unto him, *Thou* wicked and slothful servant, thou knewest that
27 I reap where I sowed not, and gather where I have not strewed: [?][11] Thou oughtest
therefore to have put [thrown, βαλεῖν][12] my money to the exchangers, and *then* at my
28 coming I should have received mine own with usury [interest].[13] Take therefore the
29 talent from him, and give *it* unto him which [that] hath [the] ten talents. For unto
every one that hath shall be given, and he shall have abundance: but from him that
30 hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath. And cast ye the unprofitable
servant into [the, τὸ] outer darkness: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.

[1] Ver. 14.—[The interpolation of the Authorized Version is unwarranted and unnecessary, and not found in the earlier English Versions. Lange inserts *he is* (viz., the *Son of Man*, ver. 13); others: *it is;* Ewald and Conant omit all insertions, and translate simply: *For as a man going abroad* (Ewald: *Denn sowie ein Verreisender*, etc.). *See* Lange's *Exeg. Notes.* Meyer *in loc.* takes ὥσπερ as *anantapodoton*, as Mark xiii. 34; comp. Rom. v. 12. It was intended to connect the whole parable with ὥσπερ, and then to add a οὕτως with an apodosis such as: οὕτως καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ποιήσει, or οὕτως ἔσται καὶ ἡ παρουσία τοῦ υἱοῦ τ. ἀνθρ., which was given up on account of the length of the protasis. Alford thinks, the ellipsis is rightly supplied in the Authorized English Version.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 16.—[Codd. A.**, B., C., D., L., Lachmann, and Tregelles, read: ἐκέρδησεν, *he gained.* Alford thinks, it was inserted from vers. 17 and 22. The reading of the *text. rec.:* ἐποίησεν, is sustained by Cod. Sinait., and retained by Tischendorf and Alford. But the meaning is the same: *he made, i. e., he produced, he gained*, and was so rendered by the English Versions preceding that of the Bishops. *See* Conant *in loc.*—P. S.]

[3] Ver. 17.—[Comp. ὁ τὰ πέντε, *the five*, ver. 16. The λαβών is necessarily implied in the second clause, and hence the interpolation *had received* (or rather in the imperf.: *received*) is justified. The verb can be easily spared in Greek. Ewald imitates the Greek brevity in his version: *Ebenso gewann auch der die zwei andere zwei.* But this is too harsh, and would not do at all in English. Some MSS. add after δύο: τάλαντα λαβών, which is thrown out by the *text. rec.*, Tischendorf, Alford, etc. Lachmann and Tregelles omit also the words: καὶ αὐτός, *he also*, in which they are sustained by Codd. B., C., and also by Cod. Sinaiticus.—P. S.]

[4] Ver. 18.—Lachmann adds τάλαντον after A. and ancient versions.

[5] Ver. 18.—Lachmann, Tischendorf, [Tregelles, Alford], read: ἔκρυψε, for the *lect. rec.:* ἀπέκρυψε, according to most witnesses. [Cod. Sinait. likewise reads: ἔκρυψε.—P. S.]

[6] Ver. 20.—The words: ἐπ' αὐτοῖς, *beside them* [the enabling cause of his gain], here and in ver. 22 are omitted in Codd. B., D., L., al., [also in Cod. Sinait.], and stricken by Lachmann and Tischendorf. They may have been added to increase the modesty of the expression.

[7] Ver. 21.—[*Thou* is an unnecessary interpolation, and should be omitted, as in ver. 23.—P. S.]

[8] Ver. 21.—[Lit.: *thou wast* (hast been) *faithful over little, I will set thee over much*, ἐπὶ ὀλίγα ἧς πιστὸς, ἐπὶ πολλῶν σε καταστήσω. So the German Versions of Luther, de Wette, Ewald, Lange; also the English Versions of Coverdale, Kendrick, Conant.—P. S.]

[9] Ver. 23.—[Comp. note 8, ver. 21.—]

[10] Ver. 24.—[The British Bibles here and in ver. 26 read *strawed*, the rarer form for *strew, streuen.* I followed here, as elsewhere, the spelling of the Am. Bible.—P. S.]

[11] Ver. 26.—[A question of surprise and displeasure, and hence with an interrogation mark, as in the Lat. Vulg., Coverdale, Campbell, Conant, and nearly all the German Versions. De Wette and Lange, however, regard it as an ironical concession, in which case the punctuation of the Am. Bible Society's edition (colon) is correct. The British Bibles have a period.—P. S.]

[12] Ver. 27.—[Lange: *hinwerfen.* The verb βαλεῖν expresses not the worthlessness of the money which was a good gift of God, but the perfect ease with which it might have been made to produce interest in the hands of brokers and bankers, who then as now received money on deposit at interest and lent it to others at higher rates.—P. S.]

[13] Ver. 27.—[Σὺν τόκῳ, from τόκος (τίκτω, τέτοκα), birth; child; gain, interest, in the LXX for נֶשֶׁךְ. The passage implies the lawfulness of taking interest. There was a saying in the ancient Church, γίνεσθε δόκιμοι τραπεζῖται (Origen, *on Matt.* xxii.), which was attributed to Christ, and may possibly have been derived from this verse, as expressing the moral lesson of this and the kindred parable in Luke xix. *See* SUICER'S *Thesaurus, sub* τραπεζ.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The Signification of the Parable of the Talents.—In this parable the idea of retribution, as affecting individual Christians, comes prominently forward; as the first referred that retribution to office-bearers in the Church, and the second to the Church itself as a whole. As there the former parable laid the stress upon the watchfulness, internal religion, here we have the requirement of watchfulness in persevering, unwearied fidelity and activity through the Spirit. [Compare the remarks of Trench: While the virgins were represented as *waiting* for the Lord, we have here the servants *working* for Him. There the inward spiritual rest of the Christian was described—here his external activity. There, by the end of the foolish virgins, we are warned against declensions and decays in the inward spiritual life—here against sluggishness and sloth in our outward vocation and work. That parable enforced the need of keeping the heart with all diligence—this the need of giving all diligence also to the outward work, if we would be found of Christ in peace at the day of His appearing. Alford likewise refers this parable to the *active* side of the Christian life, while the preceding parable sets forth the *contemplative* side. "There, the foolish virgins failed *from thinking their part too easy*—here the wicked servant fails *from thinking his too hard.* The parable is still concerned with Christians (τοὺς ἰδίους δούλους), and not the world at large. We must remember the relation of master and slave, in order to understand his delivering to them his property, and punishing them for not fructifying with it." But this may be understood as well from the stand-point of free labor.—P. S.]

As it respects the relation of the parable of the *Talents*, to the parable of the *Pounds* (*Minas*) in Luke

xix. 2–27, it is somewhat analogous to the relation of the parable of the marriage of the King's Son, ch. xxii. 2, to the parable of the Supper, Luke xiv. 16. We must not be misled by the appearance of likeness into a denial of the fact, that we have to do here with an altogether new and different parable. Meyer says: "The analogous parable in Luke xix. is to be regarded as a modification, which arose, in evangelical tradition, of our present original and simpler parable. In its form in Luke, probably an original and independent parable (concerning the rebellious subjects) had become blended with that of the talents (comp. Strauss, i. 636 sq.; Ewald, p. 339 sq.)." Such a perfect confusion of parable with fiction would be discarded at once by a careful estimate of the practical doctrinal scope of the former. That would altogether set aside the following alternative (of Meyer): "If we entertain the thought that the parables in Luke and those in Matthew were delivered by Christ at different times, we must either admit the unnatural supposition that the simpler form in Matthew was the later (as Kern maintains), or contradict the narrative by assuming that Jesus delivered the parables in Matthew earlier than those in Luke (Schleiermacher, Neander)." The idea of "simpler" has nothing to do here, where, as even de Wette acknowledges, the parables are internally different in their scope. The differences are plain: 1. As to their respective motives. In Luke, Jesus designs to repel the supposition that the advent would soon, or *immediately*, in a chronological sense, make its appearance; in Matthew, He intends to quicken the expectation that, in a religious sense, it would *soon come*. 2. In the former, the Lord is a high-born noble, who was to receive a kingdom; here, He is simply a landowner. There, the Lord's absence is distance in space; here, it is length of time (there: ἐπορεύθη εἰς χώραν μακράν; here: μετὰ χρόνον πολὺν ἔρχεται). There, the servants are ten, the number of the world's age (*see* the ten virgins); here, they are three, the number of the Spirit. In the former, all the servants receive one pound—doubtless the one equal office of testimony; here, the first servant receives five talents, the second two, the third one—thus noting individually different endowment, diverse degrees of the gift of the Spirit and grace. There, the gain is not in relation to the pounds—there are ten pounds from the one, five pounds from the one—because the result of official blessing may be past all reckoning; here, the gain is proportioned to the gift—five pounds from five, two from two—because the gift of the Spirit as such can have an objective blessing only according to its subjective degree. There, the last servant lays up the one pound, which makes him equal to the rest, in a napkin, unused, signifying his idleness; here, he buries it in the earth, signifying the prostitution of spiritual gifts to the service of the world and the flesh. There, the recompense of fidelity is the extension of the charge and vocation, the being placed over ten and over five cities; here, it is an entrance into the joy of their Lord:—the former in harmony with official relation, and the latter in harmony with the personal spiritual life. There, the idle servant was punished by the pound being taken from him (removal from office); here, he is cast into the outer darkness, condemned to eternal woe. In Luke, the parable closes with the nobleman being changed into a king, who punishes his rebellious servants; in Matthew, it closes with the just administration of the landowner—although the king comes into all the more glorious prominence in the last parable, ver. 31 seq. The resemblance in the tone of the wicked servant's words, and the Lord's rejoinder, can have no effect in disturbing our conviction of the distinctness of the two parables. And upon this point, it is to be carefully noted that the servant in Luke, in accordance with the *official* relation, wraps his pound in a napkin; while the servant in Matthew, in accordance with the *spiritual* relation, hides it in the earth; further, that the former ought to have put his gold into the bank (the office is given back to the Church); while the latter should have taken it to the exchangers (spiritual gifts are quickened by contact with earnest leaders and members of the Church). Thus the former parable sets before us simply the external, social, official side of the Christian calling; the latter, the internal and the individual. This explains the difference between the gain of fidelity in the one case and in the other; and, further, that the slothful servant in office and the slothful servant in the service of the Spirit for the most part coincide, although in individual traits they differ. Official vocation produces its outward results broadly through the world; and an apostle might gain half the population of the earth, or bring the whole generation under his own influence. On the other hand, the spiritual gift works inwardly in the spiritual domain. In this it gains just so much life as corresponds with its related capacity of the Spirit. Externally, this gain may seem less; but in the estimate of the kingdom of grace it is otherwise. It is a higher reward to enter into the joy of our Lord, than to be set over the cities in the other world. In harmony with this distinction, the one slothful servant *did not work at all;* the other hid his spiritual gift *in the earth*. This πονηρός, too, has a specific predicate attached to him, ὀκνηρός; and his requital is not merely discharge from office, but *spiritual woe*.

Ver. 14. **For he is as a man.**—Here it is customary to explain the construction as an abrupt transition and an incomplete clause (an *anantapodoton*), as in Rom. v. 12. But the previous verse is latently carried on in the sense: *you know neither the day nor the hour wherein the Son of Man cometh; for He is*, etc.

Delivered unto them his goods.—The spiritual blessing of His life and salvation. Christ entrusts to Christians in this world the treasure of His spiritual life.

Ver. 15. **To every man according to his own ability,** κατὰ τὴν ἰδίαν δύναμιν.—Spiritual gifts are regulated by the kind and degree of personal susceptibility and capacity. Compare the doctrine of the χαρίσματα, 1 Cor. xii. ["There is no Pelagianism in this; for each man's powers are themselves the gift of God." Alford. But the words ἑκάστῳ κατ' ἰδίαν δύναμιν imply that every man has a natural endowment, a sacred trust and mission to fulfil in this world.—P. S.]

And straightway he went abroad.—The nearest possible approximation of the parable to the fact, that the ascension and Pentecost are closely connected; although the order is inverted.* There

* [Comp. the remarks of TRENCH: "In the things earthly the householder's distribution of the gifts naturally and of necessity precedes his departure; in the heavenly it is not altogether so; the Ascension, or departure, goes before Pentecost, or the distribution of gifts; yet the *straightway* still remains in full force: the interval between them was the smallest, one following hard upon the other, however the order was reversed. The four verses which follow (16–19) embrace the whole period intervening between the first and second coming of Christ."—P. S.]

had been, however, a preparatory bestowment of the Spirit before the ascension. *See* the farewell discourses in John, and ch. xx. Meyer: "*Straightway*, without precise orders for the application of the money." But some general orders are presupposed by the subsequent judgment; while the particular employment of the personal endowment is entrusted to the individual. Every one must know his peculiar vocation.

Ver. 18. **Hid his lord's money.**—Contrary to duty and to dignity. The money in the earth is the spirit in the flesh.

Ver. 20. **Gained beside them,** ἐπ' αὐτοῖς.—In addition to what was entrusted, and by means thereof. [Comp. the plainer statement in Luke xix. 16: "Lord, thy pound hath gained ten pounds," and John xv. 5: "Without Me, ye can do nothing." Every gift of God may be doubled and even increased tenfold by faithful and conscientious use, while it may be lost by neglect. This is true of spiritual and temporal gifts of all kinds.—P. S.]

Ver. 21. The Vulgate and Cod. A.* read εὖγε, which may stand absolutely, as in Luke xix. 17; the εὖ, on the other hand, as Meyer observes, must be connected with the verb. [Alford, however, thinks that εὖ, according to later Greek usage, need not be connected with ἐπὶ ὀλίγα ἧς πιστός, but may bear the sense of εὖγε: *well done!* as in the English Vers.—P. S.]

[**I will set thee over much.**—This implies new spheres of activity and usefulness in the kingdom of glory in heaven; or—according to Stier, Alford, and all who refer this and the preceding parable to the *pre-millennial* advent—in the millennium on earth.—P. S.]

Into the joy of thy Lord.—De Wette: "Kuinoel and others interpret after Esth. ix. 17 (Sept.), where χαρά = מִשְׁתֶּה, *entertainment;* better, probably, from the feast of joy which the lord would celebrate on his return; Fritzsche, after Chrysostom, of the Messianic blessedness,—the parable passing over into the reality." Doubtless, the Lord's joyful festival is meant; but this signifies the inheritance of Christ. [Alford refers the χαρά not to a feast, but to the joy arising from the completion of the work and labor of love, of which the first sabbatical rest of the creation was typical, Gen. i. 31; ii. 2; Heb. iv. 3–11; xii. 2; Rev. iii. 21.—P. S.]

Ver. 24. **That thou reapest where thou hast not sown.**—The picture of a hard, and withal selfish man. The saying shows: 1. That the servant, as a self-seeker, separated his own interest from his lord's, and therefore reckoned his lord to be a self-seeker also; 2. that he promised himself no personal spiritual joy in trading with the entrusted pound; 3. that he would tacitly reproach his lord with having given him too little: 4. that he would not only self-righteously excuse his own slothfulness of spirit, but also overrule and censure his lord; 5. that, with all this, he really held his master to be not an over-hard man, but an over-gentle man, against whom he could dare to use such language with impunity.—**Where thou hast not strewed.**—Meyer understands here again, as in ch. xxi. 43, a winnowing, against Erasmus, Beza, and others, who interpret the διασκορπίζειν of *sowing;* thinking that otherwise there would be a tautological parallel. But the new idea introduced is that of intensification: *sowing and reaping, abundantly scattering and bringing into the barn.* In winnowing, it is the straw that is scattered, and not the wheat. [Alford directs attention to the connection of thought between the last parable of our Lord with His first on the Sower (ch. xiii. 3–9). He looks for fruit where He has sown, but not beyond the power of the soil. He expects not so much success, as faithfulness which does not depend on the absolute amount, but is measured by the degree of ability and opportunity. Hence He says: *good and faithful* (not: *successful*) servant.—P. S.]

Ver. 25. **And I was afraid.**—De Wette and Meyer: He might have lost the talent in trading. But that would have been in some sense praiseworthy. His fear was more abject: he would not take trouble for the benefit of a selfish lord.*

Ver. 26. **Thou knewest that I reaped.**—Kuinoel and de Wette: Concessively and ironically spoken; but according to Meyer, a question of surprise. Doubtless de Wette is right. The servant has condemned himself as a liar. If he really regarded his lord as a hard man, and yet would risk nothing in trade, he might have adopted a safe method of gain for his master, and placed the money into the hands of the changers. Thus at least the interest would have been secured.

Ver. 27. **Thrown my money to the bankers.**—Meyer: Throw it on the money-table; βαλεῖν exhibits the sloth of his manner. The changers held a public bank among the ancients, at which they received and lent money. [Olshausen and Trench apply the τραπεζῖται to those stronger characters who may lead the more timid to the useful employment of gifts which they have not energy to use. Alford objects to this interpretation, and refers to the machinery of religious and charitable societies in our day as very much in the place of the τραπεζῖται."—P. S.]

I might have received mine own.—If thou didst thus separate thy interest from mine, thou wast bound to give the money to the changers, that I might have received *mine* with interest. A striking rebuke *ex concessis!*

Ver. 28. **Take from him therefore.**—The negative punishment, entering into the judgment of the servant himself: separation.—**And give it to him that hath the ten talents.**—Thus even his judgment passes over into the praise of God.

Ver. 29. **For unto every one that hath.**—*See* ch. xiii. 12, p. 240.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. On the meaning of the parable, *see* the *Exegetical Notes.* All its individual traits are regulated by the different relation of the talents; as in Luke xix. they signify offices, and here the individual gifts of grace. Thus, the concluding circumstance, that the one pound is given to him who had ten pounds, has in the two cases a diverse significance. In Luke, the sense of the parable is this, that the neglected office devolved or passed over to the highest fidelity; in Matthew, the truth is set forth, that the unfaithfulness of the slothful servant increases the spiritual life of the faithful, as affording him matter of constant warning and spiritual meditation, and the means of enlarging his knowledge of the divine government of souls.

* [There is an inconsistency between that pretended fear and this insolent speech, which betrays the falsehood of the πονηρὸς δοῦλος.—P. S.]

2. If we refer this parable to the doctrine of election, we find in it the *unlimited differences* which the Scripture teaches, as opposed to the *unlimited contrast of destiny* which the Augustinian doctrine of predestination maintains. Each has his special religious talent or capital (the ἰδία δύναμις, ver. 15) in his original nature, and this becomes to him in the Church a charisma or gift (ἔδωκεν ἑκάστῳ). The destination to salvation is thus universal: the capability and the call to fidelity in all the same, the measure of the gift is different, as are the degrees of glory. But if the least endowed in regard to fulness of life (for in reference to truth and fidelity no one is less endowed than another) scorns and neglects his pound, that was not his destiny, but is his fault. The less richly he was provided in himself, the more anxious should he have been to enrich himself by connection with the more eminent members of the Church. (Comp. the author's *Positive Dogmatik*, p. 956 sqq.)

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The judgment of the Lord upon all the individual members of the Church: 1. Its rightful ground: the appointment and the obligation of the servants. 2. Its test: the true application of gifts. 3. Its universality: the most richly and the least endowed are brought to account. 4. Its requital: on the one hand, the praise and the joy of the Lord; on the other hand, the despoiling and casting out into the fellowship of the lost.—*Thy gifts* are entrusted to the day of reckoning.—Manifold gifts, but *one* duty and *one* spirit.—The endowment of a Christian is a call to work for the Lord.—Every one receives the pound of the heavenly spiritual life according to the measure of his capacity.—The double obligation which the absence of the Lord imposes upon Christians: 1. They are bound to fidelity, because the Lord is so *far* (and has committed to them all His interests in this world); 2. they are bound to fidelity, because He is so *near* (invisibly present in His gifts, and may come at any moment to reckon).—The grand and stimulating thought, that Christ has committed to His servants in this world all His goods.—The confidence of the Lord the source of His servants' fidelity.—Trading with the riches of Christ the highest and noblest gain.—Christ's business prospers only through fidelity.—The Church is a place of trade, the noblest and the richest.—The principles of commerce with spiritual gifts: 1. As regards God: giving up all, to gain all. 2. As it respects our neighbor: to give is more blessed than to receive. 3. As it respects ourselves: to gain the one thing needful in exchange for many things.* 4. As it respects the world: to give up the visible for the invisible.—Trading with spiritual gifts the most perilous and yet the safest commerce.—The praise and the reward of the faithful servants of Christ in the hour of reckoning: 1. The praise, of having been faithful over a little; 2. the reward, of being set over much, and of entering into the joy of the Lord.—The end of our spiritual work a divine rest forever, a Sabbath of God.—The wicked servant; or, let no man undervalue the gift which God has entrusted to him.—How far a grudge against Christ underlies all unfaithfulness in the use of spiritual gifts.—Man becomes wicked evermore through thinking evil of God.—The Christian becomes wicked evermore through thinking evil of Christ.—The self-seeker ascribes his own self-seeking to God also, to excuse himself.—The unfaithful are obliged to condemn themselves at last by their own excuses.—The frightful pit of earth in which the heavenly gifts of the Christians are buried.—The infinite spiritual woes which must be entailed by the prostitution of spiritual light to the service of the flesh.—The nameless work without which the slothful will have to do when the faithful rest.

Starke:—We men in the world are stewards of the manifold gifts of God, 1 Cor. iv. 1–4; Luke xvi. 2.—*Hedinger*: God distributes His gifts strangely, but holily: let no man think that he has received too little, Rom. xii. 6.—In the gifts of God no one must be vain, or envious; but every one must use his own portion to the glory of God and the good of his fellows.—God bestows his gifts and goods on men, not that they may be buried, wasted, appropriated to self, or imagined their own, but that they may faithfully trade with them, 1 Cor. xii. 7.—Of a steward nothing more is expected, and nothing less, than fidelity, 1 Cor. iv. 2.—*Canstein*: Few gifts may be turned to much account.—Truth does not shun the light, but comes to it, John iii. 21.—He buries his Lord's goods who seeks only his own.—He who neglects nothing in his Christianity, will have confidence in the day of judgment, 1 John iii. 21.—In the future reckoning no man will be forgotten or overlooked, 2 Cor. v. 10.—To be called a good and faithful servant of God, is a title more honorable than any that this world can give, Ps. cxvi. 16.—The wicked servant does not know Jesus as a merciful Master, but as another Moses who requires more than man has strength for.—When we do not see the gracious countenance of God in Christ, God appears to us hard and fearful.—Slothfulness and baseness the two characteristics of the unfaithful servant.—*Luther*: His knavery consisted in this, that he condemns his Lord for hardness, and scorns the way of grace (self-denial).—How many, who now receive an unlimited number of honorable names, will one day be called, *Thou fool!*—*Hedinger*: He who makes a good use of the first beginnings of grace, will go on well and soon grow rich; he who lets his grace decline within him, will soon be without it altogether.

Braune:—There is no standing still, either progress and gain, or retrogress and loss. [Forward and finally all, or backward and finally nothing.]

Lisco:—The humility of the faithful servants, who attribute all blessing and increase not to themselves, but to the entrusted pounds.—It does not depend upon whether one has effected much or little according to the measure of his power and his sphere, but whether he has been faithful and diligent or not: the spirit is the main thing.—This servant represents such as excuse their neglect in various ways: by pleading the little which has been entrusted to them, or the fear they had of encountering the dangerous influences of the world, or the consequent necessity which they felt of retreating into solitude and quiet piety.

Gerlach:—Unbelieving despondency is always connected with slothfulness, when unbelief becomes a permanent condition.

Heubner:—Fidelity in little things is a pearl of great price.—There, *thou hast thine own*: perfect breach with God; he throws up his service altogeth-

* [In German: "*Das Eine erkaufen um das Viele*" (no doubt an allusion to Luke x. 42), which the Edinb. translator has upset thus: *to sell one thing, to gain much!* He probably mistook *erkaufen* for *verkaufen*.—P. S.]

er.—Wicked (πονηρέ) he is called, because his heart was false, attributing falsely to God this unloving hardness. His conscience smote him in secret, and testified to him that God was not as he painted Him.—When God lays much upon us, He offers us abundance of strength to do and to bear.

[Burkitt (condensed):—1. Christ the Lord of the universe, and owner of all His servants' goods. 2. Talents: riches, honors; gifts of mind, wisdom, learning; gifts of grace. 3. Freedom of distribution to all, but in different measure. 4. Every talent is given to improve for our Master's use. 5. Every one is accountable for every talent. 6. All faithful servants will be rewarded with the joy of their Lord. 7. No excuses shall serve the slothful or unfaithful servant at the bar of Christ. 8. The unfaithful servant will be punished (*a*) negatively, by the loss of his talent, (*b*) positively, by suffering the misery of hell with gnashing of teeth, *i. e.*, rage and indignation against God, the saints, and against himself.—(Similar practical remarks with a more minute analysis, *see* in Matthew Henry.)—D. Brown (condensed):—1. Christ exhorts us in this parable, not "*Wait* for your Lord," but "*Occupy* till I come." Blessed is he whom the Lord shall find *working* (as well as *watching*, according to the preceding parable). 2. Christians are all servants of Christ, but differ in natural capacity, acquirements, providential position, influence, means, and opportunities. 3. Fidelity will be rewarded, not the amount or nature of the work. 4. Idleness and unprofitableness in the Lord's service is sufficient to condemn.—W. Nast:—1. The talents of all men are free gifts of God, so that there is no room either for self-boasting, or for self-reproach; 2. they are given in trust, the Giver still retaining a claim upon them; 3. they are given to be employed and turned to the best account for the glory of the Giver.—P. S.]

FIFTH SECTION.

THE FINAL JUDGMENT IN ITS LAST AND MOST UNIVERSAL FORM UPON ALL NATIONS; AND AS SEPARATION.

Chapter XXV. 31–46.

(*The Gospel for the 26th Sunday after Trinity.*)

31 When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy[1] angels with him,
32 then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: And before him shall be gathered all
[the] nations [πάντα τὰ ἔθνη]: and he shall separate [divide, ἀφοριεῖ] them one from
another, as a [the, ὁ] shepherd divideth [ἀφορίζει] *his* [the] sheep [τὰ πρόβατα] from
33 the goats: And he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left.
34 Then shall the King say unto them [those] on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my
35 Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world: For I
was a hungered [hungry, ἐπείνασα], and ye gave me meat [to eat, φαγεῖν]:[2] I was
36 thirsty, and ye gave me drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me in: Naked, and ye
clothed me: I was sick, and ye visited me: I was in prison, and ye came unto me.
37 Then shall the righteous answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee a hungered
38 [hungering, πεινῶντα], and fed *thee?* or thirsty, and gave *thee* drink? [And, δέ] When
39 saw we thee a stranger, and took *thee* in? or naked, and clothed *thee?* Or when saw
40 we thee sick, or in prison, and came unto thee? And the King shall answer and say
unto them, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye have done *it* unto one of the least
41 of these my brethren,[3] ye have done *it* unto me. Then shall he say also unto them
[those] on the left hand, Depart[4] from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for
42 the devil and his angels: For I was a hungered [hungry], and ye gave me no meat
[did not give me to eat, οὐκ ἐδώκατέ μοι φαγεῖν]: I was thirsty, and ye gave me no
43 drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me not in: naked, and ye clothed me not:[5] sick,
44 and in prison, and ye visited me not. Then shall they also answer him, saying, Lord,
when saw we thee a hungered [hungering], or athirst [thirsting], or a stranger, or
45 naked, or sick, or in prison, and did not minister unto thee? Then shall he answer
them, saying, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye did *it* not to one of the least of
46 these, ye did *it* not to me. And these shall go away into everlasting punishment [eternal punishment, κόλασιν αἰώνιον]: but the righteous into life eternal [eternal life, or
everlasting life, ζωὴν αἰώνιον].[6]

[1] Ver. 31.—The adjective ἅγιοι of the *text. rec.* is wanting in Codd. B., D., L., [also in Cod. Sinait.], many versions [including the Vulg., which reads simply: *omnes angeli*], and fathers, and seems to be a later interpolation.

[2] Ver. 35.—[Comp. the translation of the English Version in ch. xiv. 16, where the same phrase is rendered: *give ye them to eat.*—P. S.]

[3] Ver. 40.—Τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου, although omitted by Cod. B., is well established by the majority of witnesses.

[4] Ver. 41.—[Cod. Sinait. reads ὑπάγετε for πορεύεσθε.—P. S.]

[5] Ver. 43.—[Cod. Sinait. omits the words: γυμνὸς καὶ οὐ περιεβάλετέ με. But they are well supported by the best authorities and retained in all the critical editions.—P. S.]

[6] Ver. 46.—[As the Greek uses αἰώνιον before ζωὴν as well as κόλασιν, it should be rendered by the same word (either *eternal* or *everlasting*) in both clauses. Comp. the Lat. Vulg.: *in supplicium æternum . . . in vitam æternam;* all the German Versions (*ewig*); Wiclif: *everlastynge turmente . . . everlastynge liif;* the Rheims Version: *punishment everlasting, life everlasting.* Tyndale introduced the change: *everlastinge payne . . . lyfe eternall,* which was retained in the subsequent Protestant Versions except the word *pain,* which King James' revisers gave up for *punishment.* I would prefer, however, in both cases *eternal* to *everlasting,* and translate: *into eternal punishment . . . into eternal life.* For *everlasting* refers to *extensive* infinitude or endless duration; *eternal* expresses the *intensive* infinitude, and this dynamic conception, which implies much more than mere duration or existence in time, is the prevailing idea here, without, however, excluding the other. But in any case the passage is one of the very strongest against Universalism, and the ἀποκατάστασις τῶν πάντων. Comp. also Dr. Lange's *Exeg. Notes.*—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

THE FINAL JUDGMENT. *General Remarks.*—The new salient points of the last judgment are: 1. The Son of Man as Judge unfolds His perfect kingly and judicial glory. 2. He exercises judgment now upon all the nations of the earth, and upon all the generations of men. 3. He judges individuals according to their personal conduct, with as much strictness and reality as He judges the collective whole. 4. He finds in all the consummate character of their inner life and nature so expressly stamped upon them, that He can divide them as a shepherd divides the sheep from the goats. 5. He judges, therefore, according to the perfected consummation of the spiritual life in the works, and according to the fundamental idea of all good works—love and mercy. 6. He judges according to the standard of the universal life of Christ among men of all times, as well as of the historical Christ. 7. His sentence introduces a separation which must bring the earth itself, in its ancient form, to an end; for, the good are received into the kingdom of the Father, and the wicked are cast into hell. —Thus viewed in all its extension, it presupposes the general resurrection, and forms the conclusion of the Lord's coming and parousia in this present state of things, of the one last day of a thousand years in a symbolical sense, that is, of a full and perfect judicial æon. Thus, as the first parable (ch. xxiv. 45) must be placed at the beginning of these thousand years, and the second and third exhibit the further development of the kingly, judicial administration of Christ, this last judgment forms the great conclusion, as it is exhibited in 1 Cor. xv. 24 and Rev. xx. 9.

This decides the question as to whether it is merely a judgment upon Christians, or upon other than Christians, or upon all, both Christians and not Christians. The first was maintained by Lactantius, Euthymius, Grotius, and others; the second, by such as Keil, Olshausen, Crusius;* the third, by Kuinoel, Paulus, Fritzsche. In favor of the first view—that Christians alone are here judged—it is alleged that the doctrine of the divine election comes in, ver. 34, of the righteous, ver. 37, etc. But, on the other hand, such also are spoken of as never had the consciousness of being in personal relation with Christ. It is supposed to decide in favor of the second hypothesis —those not Christians being the objects of the judgment—that the judgment proceeds not according to the law of faith, but according to the law of works and of love to man. But that Christians also will be judged at last by works, the fruits of faith, as being faith developed, is proved by Matt. vii. 21; Rom. ii. 6; 2 Cor. v. 10; Gal. vi. 8, and the whole tenor and spirit of Christianity; and that, on the other hand, all the works of men will be judged, not according to their outward appearance, but according to their spirit and motive, or according to their real, though unconscious, faith in Christ, and love or drawing toward Him, is proved by an equal number of passages; *e.g.*, Matt. x. 40; Acts x. 35; Rom. v. 18, and the universally valid word: "The Lord seeth the heart." De Wette urges, in favor of the third supposition, that in Matt. xiii. 37–43, 49, we find the plain idea of a final judgment upon Christians and those who are not Christians. De Wette here confounds good and bad with Christians and not Christians.

Our section certainly presupposes the universal nominal Christianization of the world, which must take place before the end of the world: the Christianization of mankind in this world (ch. xxiv. 14; Rom. xi. 32), and of the whole of mankind in the other (Phil. ii. 10; 1 Pet. iv. 6). Such a Christianization would necessarily follow from the advent of Christ in itself; so far as it must constrain the nations to submission, and continue throughout an entire period of judgment, Rev. xx. The common notion, which terms every supposition of a more extended final period Chiliasm or Millennarianism, does not merit notice. It is beyond all things necessary that we should distinguish between a concrete and a fantastic doctrine about the last things. The differences are: 1. The former regards the thousand years as a symbolical number, as the mark of an æon, or the period of transition for the earth and mankind from the earthly to the heavenly condition (Irenæus; *see* DORNER'S *History of Christology,* I. p. 245). But millennarianism interprets the thousand years chronologically, and seeks to define their beginning. 2. Concrete eschatology regards the last period as the manifestation of a judgment, already internally ripe, on the ground of the perfect redemption accomplished through Christ. But millennarianism is not satisfied with the first redeeming appearance of Christ; it looks forward to the second as of greater importance. 3. Concrete eschatology expects with the advent the beginning of a spiritual transformation of the present state of things; millennarianism expects a perfect glorification of things here as they are. 4. The former sees in the first resurrection only a revelation of the full life of the elect, destined to be helpers of

* [So also Stier and Alford, who understand πάντα τὰ ἔθνη to mean all the nations of the world as distinguished from the ἐκλεκτοί, who were already gathered to Christ at the first resurrection and beginning of His millennial kingdom, and who will take part in the final judgment (1 Cor. vi. 2).—P. S.]

Christ in the glorification of all humanity; but millennarianism regards that period as the time of the realization of Jewish, Jewish-Christian, pietistic, sectarian prerogatives and spiritual pretensions.*

[We add here the remarks of Dr. NAST on the different views as to the subjects of the final judgment: "According to the premillennarian view, advocated by Olshausen, Stier, and Alford, the judgment here described does not include those that constitute the Church triumphant; that is, those who, at Christ's personal coming to introduce the millennium, are either raised from the dead, or, if still living, are glorified and caught up together into the air, to meet the Lord (1 Thess. iv. 16, 17; 1 Cor. xv. 23, 24, 51, 52)—to reign with Christ, and with him to judge the world (1 Cor. vi. 2). The term 'all nations,' (πάντα τὰ ἔθνη,) it is said, is used in the same sense as the Hebrew 'the nations, or Gentiles,' as distinguished from God's chosen people, and stands here in antithesis to the 'brethren' of verse 40, who had already received their reward as wise virgins and faithful servants. In support of this view the following arguments are advanced: 1. 'Those only are said to be judged who have done it or not done it *to my brethren;* but of the brethren themselves being judged there is no mention.' In this argument we can see no point. The love of the brethren is the mark by which, our Saviour says, all men shall know that ye are my disciples. 2. 'The verdict turns upon works, and not upon faith.' Surely this will be the case with every believer or Christian, when he is brought before the judgment-seat of Christ, whether at the beginning or close of the millennium, in so far as works are the fruit of faith, or true saving faith is only that which worketh by love (Matt. vii. 21; Rom. ii. 6; 2 Cor. v. 10; Gal. vi. 8), and in so far as our good works spring from sincerity of heart, to which the Lord looketh (Acts x. 35). Moreover, unless the plan of salvation is entirely changed in the millennial state—which, if we mistake not, the premillennarians deny—the nations living during the millennium will be judged according to their works, no more and no less than those that lived before the millennium. 3. Another objection to the common view is stated by Alford thus: 'The answer of the righteous appears to me to show plainly that *they* are not to be understood as being the covenanted servants of Christ. Such an answer it would be impossible for them to make, who had done all distinctly *with reference to Christ*, and for His sake, and with His declaration of ch. x. 49–42, before them. Such a supposition would remove all reality, as, indeed, it has generally done, from our Lord's description. See the remarkable difference in the answer of the faithful servant (vs. xx. 22).' The reply that the language in question is that of humility is said not to be satisfactory; but we know not why. Besides, the difficulty appears to us to be the same with regard to the people that have lived during the millennium. If they are to be saved, they also must have done their works for Christ's sake, and, if so, they must have been conscious of it. We have given the grounds on which the premillennarian interpretation is based. In objection to it, it may further be urged that it is against common Scripture language to call any other than believers, the members of Christ's mystical body, 'sheep,' or 'righteous,' or 'the blessed of the Father, for whom the kingdom was prepared from the foundation of the world.' With regard to the difficult question of our Lord's second advent, Alford makes, at the close of his comments on the twenty-fifth chapter, a declaration breathing the docile spirit of the true Christian and of the thorough scholar. He says, (p. 238:) 'I think it proper to state, in this third edition, that having now entered upon the deeper study of the prophetic portions of the New Testament, I do not feel by any means that full confidence which I once did in the exegesis, *quoad* prophetical interpretation here given of the three portions of this chapter xxv. But I have no other system to substitute, and some of the points here dwelt on seem to me as weighty as ever. I very much question whether the thorough study of Scripture prophecy will not make me more and more distrustful of all human systematizing, and less willing to hazard strong assertion on any portion of the subject. July, 1855.'"—In the fourth edition Alford adds: "Endorsed, Oct. 1858."—P. S.]

The representation of this judgment is not a parable or simile, as Olshausen thinks. It contains some of the elements of a parable; but really sets the judgment before us in its concrete form.

[Ver. 31. Jerome remarks on the *time* of this discourse: "He who was within two days to celebrate the passover and to be crucified, fitly now sets forth the glory of His triumph." This contrast deepens our view of the divine foresight and majesty of our Lord, and the sublimity of this description.—**And all the [holy] angels with Him.**—As witnesses and executive agents who take the deepest interest in man's destiny and final salvation, comp. Heb. i. 14; Matt. xiii. 40; xxiv. 31; Luke xii. 8. Bengel: *Omnes angeli: omnes nationes: quanta celebritas!* "The first-born of God, the morning stars of creation—beings that excel in strength, whose intelligence is immense, whose love for God and His universe glows with a quenchless ardor, and whose speed is as the lightning. Who can count their numbers? They are the bright stars that crowd in innumerable constellations every firmament that spans every globe and system throughout immensity."—P. S.]

Then shall he sit.—Expression of finished victory.

Ver. 32. **And before Him shall be gathered.**—Intimating a perfect voluntary or involuntary acknowledgment and submission; comp. Phil. ii. 10.

And He shall divide them.—This is not merely the beginning, but the fundamental outline of all that follows.—**As the shepherd divideth.**—He was Himself the Shepherd, also, of the goats,—the Shepherd of all mankind. Hence He knows how to distinguish them perfectly, as they are perfected in good or evil.—**The sheep from the goats.**—Properly: the lambs from the he-goats, ἔριφοι. Goats and sheep are represented as pasturing together (comp. Gen. xxx. 33). They were classed together under the name of small cattle. The wicked are here exhibited under the figure of goats. Why? Grotius: "on account of their wantonness and stench." De Wette says (referring to Ezek. xxxiv. 17, where, however, it is otherwise): "The goats (he-goats) are of less value to the shepherd; they are wilder, and less easily led." Meyer: "Because the value of these animals was held to be less (Luke xv. 29); hence also, in ver. 33, the disparaging diminutive τὰ ἐρίφια."*

* [In German: *geistliche Anmassungen.* The Edinb. trsl. has *dignities!*—P. S.]

* [So also Hilary and Chrysostom: "Sheep are profitable by their wool, their milk, their offspring. Not so goats: they represent *unfruitfulness* of life." Wordsworth adopts this view and adds with Euthymius and Grotius the δυσωδία, in opposition to the sweet and fragrant sacrifice of holy and charitable deeds."—P. S.]

But the main point of distinction is the gentleness and tractableness of the sheep, which points to a nobler nature; and the wild stubbornness of the goats, exhibiting an inferior, egotistical nature.*

Ver. 33. **On his right hand.**—The side of preference and success.—**On the left.**—The opposite. On the omens of the right and left, *see* Schöttgen and Wetstein; comp. Virg. *Æn.* vi. 542 sqq.

Ver. 34. **The King.**—Not parabolical, as Olshausen thinks; but Christ in His advent comes forward with all His real kingly dignity.

Ye blessed of My Father.—They are the really blessed, as the regenerate, penetrated and renewed with the Spirit, life, and blessing of the Father, Eph. i. 3.

Inherit the kingdom.—*See* Rom. viii.—**Prepared from the foundation of the world.**—De Wette finds here the idea of predestination, Rom. viii. 28. But what is here spoken of is the eternal foundation of the kingdom for the subjects of the King. There is no contradiction to John xiv. 2. For here the calling and foundation is referred to; there, the actual building up of the heavenly community.†

Ver. 35. **Ye took Me in,** συνηγάγετέ με.—Meyer: As members of My household. Deut. xxii. 2: συνάξεις αὐτὸν ἔνδον εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν. Oriental hospitality was an essential form of love to our neighbor. *See*, in Wetstein and Schöttgen, the rabbinical sayings concerning the promise of paradise to the hospitable.

[Vers. 35, 36. Heubner: "The acts of love here named are not such as require merely an outlay of money, but such as involve also the sacrifice of time, strength, rest, comfort," etc. On the other hand, Webster and Wilkinson justly observe on ver. 36, that the assistance to the sick and prisoners here is not healing and release, which only few could render, but visitation, sympathy, attention, which all can bestow. But whatever good they did, was done in faith and in humility, and consequently the product of divine grace. For charity is the daughter of faith, and faith is the gift of the Holy Spirit, who unites us to Christ.—P. S.]

Ver. 37. **Lord, when saw we Thee?**—De Wette: "The language of modesty." Olshausen: "The language of unconscious humility." Meyer: "Actual declining of what was imputed, since they had never done to Christ *Himself* these services of love. The explanation is given in ver. 40." Certainly, they have not yet any clear notion of the ideal Christ of the whole world. But this is connected with their humility; and it must not be lost sight of, since the opposite characteristic among the reprobate is exhibited as self-righteousness. [Origen: "It is from humility that they declare themselves unworthy of any praise for their good deeds, not that they are forgetful of what they have done."]

Ver. 40. **To one of the least of these My brethren.**—Not the apostles alone, but Christians generally, and pre-eminently the least of them. They are the least, the poorest, the last, in whom the divine life, which the Lord here recognises as brotherly love, is awakened.

[Stier, confining this judgment to the heathen, infers from this description that "a dogmatically developed faith in the Lord is not required of all men," and condemns "all narrow dogmatism that would set limits to God's infinite love." Alford, taking a similar view of this section, remarks: "The sublimity of this description surpasses all imagination—Christ, as the Son of Man, the Shepherd, the King, the Judge—as the centre and end of all human love, bringing out and rewarding His *latent* grace in those who have lived in love—everlastingly punishing those who have quenched it in an unloving and selfish life—and in the accomplishment of His mediatorial office, causing even from out of the iniquities of a rebellious world His sovereign mercy to rejoice against judgment." But we must not weaken the fundamental principle: out of Christ there is no pardon and no salvation. Every consideration of God's justice and mercy, and every impulse of Christian charity leads us to the hope that those will be ultimately saved, who, without knowing Christ in this life have unconsciously longed after Him as the desire of all nations and of every human soul, but it can only be through an act of faith in Christ, whenever He shall be revealed to them, though it be only on the judgment day. We cannot admit different terms of salvation.—P. S.]

Ver. 41. **Ye cursed.**—Through their own fault penetrated by the curse of God. The appended "*of My Father*" is not now found here as in ver. 34. And so also, "*from the beginning of the world*" is not added to "*prepared*" here. Nor is it said, "prepared *for you*," but, "**for the devil.**"* The great judgment of fire is prepared for the devil, as a punishment for devilish guilt. Thus, these are here represented as having plunged themselves into the abyss of demoniac reprobation. The Rabbins disputed whether Gehenna was prepared before or after the first day of creation. According to the gospel, it will not be finished and made effective till the final judgment of the world (*see* Rev. xx. 10). The scholastic theology of the middle ages,† instead of making it a final period, as in the gospel, gradually dated it back to the beginning, as the Rabbins.

[Vers. 42, 43. Only sins of *omission* are mentioned here; showing that the absence of good works, the destitution of love, or the dominion of selfishness, disqualifies man for blessedness, and is

* [Similarly Origen, Theophylact, and Maldonatus, who explains: *Boni oves appellantur quia mites sunt, mali autem hirci quia asperi et per prærupta ascendentes, id est, non acta et plana incidentes via.* Nast combines uncleanness and stubbornness as the two points of comparison of the bad with the goats, but mentions only meekness on the part of the sheep.—P. S.]

† [Bengel derives from the word ὑμῖν, prepared *for you*, an argument against the scholastic notion that men were created or elected to fill up the number of fallen angels: *Ergo homines electi non sunt suffecti in locum angelorum, qui peccarunt.*—P. S.]

* [Similar observations are made by Alford and Wordsworth: "In verse 34," says the latter, "Christ describes the joys of heaven as a κληρονομία prepared for *men* by God even from the beginning. But the pains of hell are not described as *prepared* for *men*, but for the *devil* and his angels. God designs eternal happiness for men; they incur eternal misery by their own acts."—The significance of the omissions and change in the two cases was early observed even by Origen and Chrysostom, and is urged also by Maldonatus, Olshausen, Stier, Nast, and others.—Origen: "He says not now: *Ye cursed of My Father*, because of all blessing the Father is the author, but each man is the origin of his own curse when he does the things that deserve the curse."—Maldonatus: "*Non dixit: '*MALEDICTI *Patris mei,' sicut justis dixerat:* 'VENITE, BENEDICTI PATRIS MEI,' *quia Deus non maledictionis, sed benedictionis, non pœnæ, sed præmii auctor fuit; non quod non etiam pœnæ auctor fuerit, sed quod præmia libenter et ex animi propensione, pœnam invitus quodammodo, ut justitiæ suæ satisfaceret, præparaverit.*"—P. S.]

† [So also Dante in the famous inscription on the gate of hell; *see Inferno*, Canto iii. Stier observes, that even for the devil, who was created an angel, hell was no more foreordained than his sin, although it was prepared for him as soon as he became a devil.—P. S.]

sufficient, even without positive crimes, to exclude him from heaven.—P. S.]

Ver. 44. **And did not minister unto Thee?**—As if they would always have been ready to serve Him. But there is nothing of the spirit of love in their assumed readiness; only in the spirit of servitude they would have waited on Him had they seen Him. The ignorance of the blessed was connected with their humility, as a holy impossibility of knowing; the ignorance of the cursed was of another kind, and closely connected with self-righteousness.*

Ver. 46. **Into everlasting punishment.**—Comp. Dan. xii. 2 (εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον . . . εἰς αἰσχύνην αἰώνιον). Meyer finds the absolute idea of eternity in endlessness, and thinks even that ζωὴ αἰώνιος describes an *endless* Messianic life. But in this last idea the *intensive* boundlessness of life is expressed (an abstract endless life might be also merely an endless existence in torment); and, therefore, the predominant notion of the opposite is an *intensive* one, too. We say only, the "predominant" one. For here also, as in the doctrine of the parousia of Christ, we must distinguish between religious and chronological notions and calculations.†

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The section is a parabolical discourse‡ concerning the general judgment of the human race. Hence the essential ideas and the symbolical features are to be distinguished.

The following are the prominent *dogmatic* points:—(1) Christ is the Judge of the world; compare Acts x. 42; xvii. 31; the *Symb. Apost.* (2) The judgment shall be exercised by Him upon all mankind: all nations shall appear before the throne—not merely those existing at the end of the world, but all generations. Therefore the general resurrection is included, so that all nations may be assembled. (3) The standard of judgment will be the question, how they reputed and dealt with Christ in the world; how they regulated their conduct toward Him in His own person, and in His unseen life in humanity as the Logos; how, therefore, they honored or dishonored the Divine in themselves and in their fellow-men; how they showed christological piety in christological humanity; or how, in short, they behaved toward Christ in the widest sense of the word. (4) The demand of the judgment will be the fruit of faith in Christian love of men, or human love of Christ. Thus not merely, (*a*) doctrinal faith; or (*b*) external works without a root of faith—of actual trust in Christ, or love for the divine in humanity (done it *unto Me*, done it *not unto Me*); (*c*) nor merely individual evidences of good; but decided goodness in its maturity and consistency, as it acknowledged Christ or felt after Him, in all His concealments, with longing anticipations. (5) The specific form of the requirement will be the requirement of the fruit of mercy and compassion; for the foundation of redemption is grace, and faith in redeeming grace must ripen into the fruits of compassion: *see* this in the Lord's Prayer. Sanctified mercy, however, is only a concrete expression for perfected holiness generally, or the sanctification of Christ in the life; *see* Rev. xxi. 8; xxii. 15, 6. (6) The finished fruit of faith and disposition is identical with the man himself, ripe for judgment. (7) The judgment appears to be already internally decided by the relation which men have assumed toward Christ, or the character which they have borne; but it is published openly by the separation of those who are unlike, and the gathering together of all who are like; it is continued in the sentence which illustrates the judgment by words, and confirms it by the extorted confession of conscience; it is consummated by the fact of the one company inheriting the kingdom, and the other departing to the everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels. (8) This perfected separation implies also the total change of the earth: on the one side, the view opens upon the finished kingdom of God; on the other, the view opens upon hell, now unsealed for the lost. (9) The time of the judgment is the final and critical period in which all preparatory judgments are consummated: (*a*) the judgments of human history in this world; (*b*) the judgments in Hades in the other world (*see* Luke xvi. 19); (*c*) the great judgments which will begin at the manifestation of Christ (*see* chs. xxiv. and xxv.; Rev. xx. 1 sqq.). The more precise description of the form of this crisis is found in Rev. xx. 7–15.

As *symbolical* features of the scene, we may notice prominently:—(1) The enthronization of the Son of Man upon the judgment-seat: a figure of His perfected victorious glory (1 Cor. xv. 25). (2) The administration of Christ in the form of the separating shepherd: for He is still a shepherd; and one great reason of the judgment is the perfecting of the redemption of the good, the revelation of the kingdom (Rev. xxi.). (3) The sheep and the goats, with their separation, expressing the nature of their respective characters, as now perfectly stamped upon them in the resurrection. (4) The placing on the right hand and on the left; all the ideal characteristics of the judged being exhibited as personal relationship to Christ, and the whole sequel of the judgment being thus presented in one anticipatory act of decisive division. (5) The colloquy of the Judge and the judged: a disclosure of humility, on which the piety of the pious rests; and of pride, on which the reprobation of the wicked rests; and, at the same time, a clear exhibition of the

* [The Edinb. trsl. renders *Selbstgerechtigkeit* (= ἡ ἐμή, or ἡ ἰδία δικαιοσύνη, or δικαιοσύνη τοῦ νόμου, ἐκ νόμου, δικ. ἐξ ἔργων) here and above *ad ver.* 37 by *self-justification*, confounding the word with *Selbstrechtfertigung* (= δικαίωσις).—P. S.]

† [ALFORD: "Observe, the *same epithet* is used for κόλασις and ζωή—which are here *contraries*—for the ζωή here spoken of is not bare *existence*, which would have *annihilation* for its opposite; but *blessedness* and *reward*, to which *punishment* and *misery* are antagonist terms."—WORDSWORTH *in loc.*: "The word αἰών corresponds to the Hebrew עוֹלָם, which appears to be derived from the unused root עָלַם, *to conceal;* so that the radical idea in αἰών, as used in Holy Scripture, is *indefinite* time; and thus the word comes to be fitly applied to *this* world, of which we do not know the duration; and also to the world to come, of which no end is visible, because that world is eternal. This consideration may perhaps check speculations concerning the duration of future punishments. (?)" But this etymology of עוֹלָם is somewhat doubtful, and αἰών has nothing to do with hiding and concealing, but comes probably from ἄω, ἄημι, *to breathe, to blow;* hence life, generation, age (like the Latin *aevum*); then indefinitely for endless duration, eternity.—P. S.]

‡ [Not a parable proper. Comp. M. HENRY: "We have here a description of the process of the last judgment in the great day. There are some passages in it that are parabolical, as the separating between the sheep and the goats, and the dialogues between the judge and the persons judged; but there is no thread of similitude carried through the discourse, and, therefore, it is rather to be called a draught or delineation of the final judgment than a parable; it is, as it were, the explanation of the former parables."—P. S.]

oft-repeated truth, that men will judge themselves by their own words.

2. The historical judgment of Christ will be the simple, though solemn revelation* of that spiritual judgment which, as to its beginning, is already decided in difference of character. It is the last quiet perfecting of a state already ripe and over-ripe. The blessed of the Father are already filled with blessing; and the kingdom, the foundation of which was laid before the foundation of the world, is already in full glory, finding now in the glorification of the world, of the heaven and the earth, its new form. The accursed are also, on their part, penetrated by the curse; and the hell to which they go is the kingdom of darkness in its consummation, separated from the kingdom of light and consigned to its proper place. "From the fall of Satan downward the eternal fire began to work on him and his; and, in connection with this development, there is going on in humanity also a great spiritual torment, a great fellowship in his destruction."

3. "The coming of Christ would not be historically that which it was to be, if it were not at the same time spiritual; it would not be spiritually that which it was to be, if it were not historical also."

4. Concerning the succession of the æons or epochs of which Rev. xiv. 11; ch. xix. 3; xxi.; xxii.; and 1 Cor. xv. 26–28, speak, nothing more is here said. But in the ζωὴ αἰώνιος unlimited *intensity* is the first point, unlimited *extension* the second (for an endless existence is also imaginable as endlessly tormented), and hence the opposite conception also must be understood in the religious and dynamic sense.

5. OTTO VON GERLACH: "The circumstance that the righteous also stand before the Judge, while the contrary seems to be stated in John v. 24; 1 Cor. vi. 2, is no serious difficulty. For, every one must appear before the judgment-seat of Christ (2 Cor. v. 10; comp. John iii. 15); although the Christian knows full well that he will be no more hurt by the last judgment than he was by those earlier judgments which fell upon him in common with the wicked." We must carefully distinguish therefore between judgment to condemnation and judgment generally. The manifestation of the good will be the concrete judgment of the ungodly.

6. *Prepared for you.* — GERLACH: "From the foundation of the world: this shows that the reward in the future life will be a reward of *grace*. The *for* which follows states the ground of vocation to blessedness only so far as the works which the Lord mentions bear witness to the existence of faith." It should be said rather, "bear witness to His life in believers;" for the final judgment will be not merely the confirmation of justification, but its perfected development in life.

7. "Christ manifestly assumes the personal existence of the devil, when he says that wicked men will suffer the same doom with him." Heubner.

[8. "The great facts of the divine retribution, says MORISON, the eternal bliss of the righteous, the eternal woe of the wicked, are indisputable, and the images of uplifting or appalling grandeur in which they are enveloped cannot act too powerfully on the heart of man. But the particulars, the blissful or terrible details, are wisely withheld from our mind, which in its present state of knowledge could not comprehend them, and would only be confounded or misled by any description of them in human language."—P. S.]

[9. There is an eternal election to life, but no eternal foreordination to perdition (except as a *secondary* or *conditional* and *prospective* decree); there is a book of life, but no book of death. But "they who will serve the devil must share with him in the end."—P. S.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The great judgment in its comprehensive importance: 1. A judgment upon the whole world; 2. a whole world of judgment (all judgments summed up in one). Or: 1. The Judge of the world (the Son of Man, whom the world judged, now in His glory); 2. the judged; 3. the separation, and the twofold sentence; 4. the end and issue of all.—The judgment of the world as the last great revelation: 1. Of the great Judge; 2. of the great judgment; 3. of the great redemption.—The last judgment, the great epiphany, Titus ii. 13; and the end of the world.—Christ at that day will seal and finish His Pastoral office.—The Son of Man one with the Judge of the world: 1. The Son of Man is Judge of all; or, the divinity of the destiny of man.* 2. The Judge of all is the Son of Man; or, the humanity of the divine judgment.—Christ is all in all in the judgment: 1. He is the Judge; 2. He is the Law, according to which judgment is pronounced (whether He was or was not regarded in His brethren); 3. He is Himself the Retribution:—(*a*) the recompense of the good; (*b*) the loss of the wicked.—Individuality reigns throughout the judgment: 1. All the fundamental laws of holy life appear in the person of Christ; 2. the spirit and work of men are manifest in personal characteristics; 3. blessedness and perdition are seen in the fellowship of persons.—Christ, once crucified, will speak as the King in the judgment.—The distinctions in the divine decrees of salvation and perdition: 1. Blessedness was prepared for men from the foundation of the world; 2. condemnation (the portion of the wicked with the devil and his angels) not till the end of the world.—Christ will at that day judge the divinity of our faith by its Christlike humanity, its sacred mercy—according to its fruits.—Men's good or evil treatment of the suffering Christ in suffering humanity: 1. As the Christ *in need*: (*a*) hungry, and fed or not fed; (*b*) thirsty, and given to drink or not; (*c*) a stranger, and taken in or not. 2. As the Christ *in suffering*: (*a*) naked (poor), and clothed or not; (*b*) sick† (wretched), and visited or not; (*c*) in prison (banished, persecuted, condemned), and receiving fellowship or not.—Have ye taken in Christ, though in strange garments? In the strange garments: 1. Of nationality; 2. of religion; 3. of confession (or denomination); 4. of scholastic terminology.‡

* [Not: *the grand and awful revelation* (Edinb. trsl.). In German: *die einfache, wenn auch feierliche Enthüllung*.]

* [Not: "*of His (Christ's) human decrees*," as the Edinb. trsl. renders "*die Göttlichkeit der* (not: *Seiner*) *menschlichen Bestimmung*" (*i. e.*, destiny, end).—P. S.]

† [For which the Edinb. trsl. reads *rich*,—evidently a typographical error.]

‡ [*Der religiösen Schulsprache*, the language of different theological schools, but not "*denominational language*" (as the Edinb. trsl. has it); for this would be identical with the preceding *confession*, which the Germans use in the same sense in which we use *denomination*. Dr. Lange refers to theoretical theological differences as distinct from practical religious differences. Many disputes in the Christian Church are mere logomachies, and disappear, if they are divested of their learning, and the parties are brought face to face and heart to heart in prayer or good works as Christian brethren. —P. S.]

—The marks of good works which Christ will recognise: 1. The works of *faith*, which have, consciously or unconsciously, regarded Him in the brethren; 2. true *works* of faith, which have beheld Christ in men, and treated them accordingly, in actions (and not in dogmas only); 3. works resting on the ground of a true *humility*, which, wrought by the Spirit, knows not what good it has wrought.—Christ, as the Judge, will bring to light the most hidden roots of life, and principles of judgment: the humility of the godly, and the self-righteousness of the ungodly.—The great redemption and the great judgment are the consummation and complement of each other.—The great contrast in the issue of men's ways and purposes: the kingdom of the Father, and the fire of Satan.—*And these shall go away:* let us never forget the terrible end.

Starke:—Mark, ye scoffers, Christ will surely come to judgment; 2 Pet. iii. 4.—*Quesnel:* The sinner may do his best now to fly from the presence of God; but he must finally make his appearance before His judgment-seat, Rom. xiv. 10.—*Canstein:* That the faithful will themselves stand before the tribunal, is by no means a contradiction to their high prerogative of judging the world as spiritual kings, and of being as it were assessors of the Judge, 1 Cor. vi. 2.—*Greg. Nazianz.: Nulla re inter omnes ita colitur Deus ut misericordiâ.*—*Hedinger:* Good works shall be compensated, as if they had been done to Christ.—*Canstein:* Believers remain humble, even in their glorification.—The best good works are those which are done in hearty simplicity, and almost unthought of.—The blessed lose none of their honor through their humility; God glories in them all the more.—How great the love of Jesus, thus to call the faithful His own brethren!—If he must go into eternal fire to whom Christ says, "I was naked, etc.," what place shall receive him to whom He will have to say, "I was clothed, and ye stripped Me?" *Augustine.*—Neglect of doing good is a grievous sin, Jas. iv. 17.—*Luther:* That the ungodly will not confess to their neglect of doing good, only reveals the darkness and wretchedness of their minds, which made them refuse to know, in the time of grace, either Christ or His members; the thought they had concerning Christ in their lifetime will be most strongly declared in the judgment.—No excuse will stand in the day of judgment.—*Canstein:* The eternal rebellion of the lost against God's holy will, will be great part of their eternal woe.—Wretched prince of darkness! who cannot defend himself and his servants from the pains of hell.

Gerlach:—Two things must be specially marked in the proceedings of the judgment: the division of all men into two parts or fellowships, and that for eternity; and then the tokens which will be found on those whom the Lord will accept—self-forgetting, humble, brotherly love.—Faith alone justifies and saves (Rom. iii. 22, 24, 28; Eph. ii. 8, 9); but that only is true faith which works by love (Gal. v. 6; Jas. ii. 14; 1 Cor. xiii.). Yet we must avoid the old confusion which identifies righteousness and salvation.—The Christian, in his course, looks not back upon the past (what he has done), but forward to the goal, Phil. iii. 13, 14.—*Ye cursed,* who wilfully remained under the curse of the law from which I redeemed you, Deut. xxvii. 26; Gal. iii. 13. [The curse, however, at the end of the world, does not merely signify condemnableness, but consummate ripeness for condemnation.]—Not "Ye cursed of My Father:" their own acts, and not the Father, brought their curse upon them.—The everlasting fire which was prepared (not *for you,* but) *for the devil.*—*Chrysostom:* I prepared for you the kingdom, the fire for the devil and his angels; ye have plunged into this fire, and it is now yours.—Indeed, the fire was not from eternity prepared for the devil; but the difference is, that men were redeemed.—The second death.

Lisco:—The inseparable connection between love to Christ and love to the brethren.—Departure from Jesus, the doom of the unloving.—Their mind was like the devil's; hence they share his doom.

Heubner:—Remember always the hymn: *Dies iræ, dies illa.**—Ask often of thy soul, where will the Lord finally place thee.—The kingdom is the kingdom of glory, into which the kingdom of grace has changed.—*Prepared:* the blessedness of the good, the end of creation.—*Leo Magn.:* The passion of Christ if continued to the end of the world.—*Luther:* It is a lie to say that thou wouldst have done much good to Christ, if thou art not doing it to these, the wretched.—Unchristian, evil tendencies invariably end in communion with Satan.

Theremin:—Of blessedness and condemnation.—*Niemann:*—The glory of Christ in the judgment: He will be glorious: 1. In His power; 2. in His omniscience; 3. in His righteousness; 4. in His grace.—*Kniewel:*† How firm faith in the coming of Christ to judgment sanctifies and glorifies earthly life. It produces in us: 1. A holy fear of God; 2. genuine love; 3. sound hope.—*Dräseke:*—The great day of the kingdom a glorious day, an all-decisive day, an inevitable day, and a day profoundly mysterious.—*The same:*—The threefold judgment—in the heart, in the history of the world, in the great day.—*Reinhard:*—That we may not fear the day of judgment, we must have our hearts filled with the spirit of true Christian love to man.—*Bachmann:*—The last judgment in its glory.—*Natorp:*—God will reward every one according to his works.

[W. BURKITT (condensed): The general judgment: 1. The Person judging, *the Son of Man;* 2. the persons judged, *good* and *bad;* the one called *sheep,* for their innocency and meekness; the other *goats,* for their unruliness and uncleanness; 3. the manner of His coming to judgment, most august and glorious in His person and attendance; 4. the work of the Judge: (*a*) He will *gather all nations,* persons of all nations, sects, classes, and conditions of man; (*b*) He will *divide them,* as a shepherd his sheep,—a final separation of the godly and the wicked; (*c*) He will pronounce the sentence, of absolution of the righteous, and condemnation of the wicked; 5. the final issue.—Christ personal is not the object of our

* [This awfully sublime hymn of an humble mediæval monk, THOMAS A CELANO (about 1250), is the most perfect specimen of Latin church poetry, and sounds like the trumpet of the final judgment which will rouse the dead from their sleep of centuries. Each word contains a distinct sound and sentiment; the ear and the heart are carried on step by step with irresistible force, and skeptical reason itself must bow before the general judgment as an awful, impending reality which will confront at last every individual. The *Dies iræ* is introduced with great effect in Goethe's *Faust.* There are over 70 German, and many English translations (by Walter Scott, Trench, Davidson, Coles, who alone furnished 18, etc.) of this giant hymn, as it is called, but none comes up fully to the majestic force and overpowering music of the original. It has given rise also to some of the best judgment hymns in modern languages, and to famous musical compositions of Palestrina, Pergolese, Haydn, Cherubini, Weber, and Mozart.—P. S.]

† [A preacher in Danzig, not to be confounded (as is done in the Edinb. trsl.) with *Kuinoel,* the commentator.—P. S.]

pity and charity, but Christ mystical is exposed to want and necessity.—Christ keeps a faithful record of all our acts of pious charity, when we have forgotten them.—Christ calls His poorest members: *My brethren.*—God is the author and procurer of man's happiness (" ye blessed *of My Father* . . . the kingdom prepared *for you from the foundation of the world,*" ver. 34); but man only is the author of his own misery (" ye cursed, . . . *for the devil,*" etc., ver. 41).—Sins of omission are damning as well as sins of commission (vers. 42-45).—The one sin of unmercifulness is enough to damn a person, because it deprives him of the grace of the gospel.—If the uncharitable shall be damned, where shall the cruel appear?—MATTHEW HENRY (condensed):—The general judgment: 1. The appearance of the Judge in the bright cloud of glory and with the myriads of angels as His attendants and ministers; 2. the appearing of all the children of men before Him; 3. the separation; 4. the process of judgment: (*a*) the glory conferred upon the righteous: they are called blessed and admitted into the kingdom, on account of their works of charity done in faith and humility, the grace of God enabling them thereto; (*b*) the condemnation of the wicked: *Depart from Me, ye cursed,* etc.—every word has terror in it, like that of the trumpet on Mount Sinai, waxing louder and louder, every accent more and more doleful. The reason of this sentence: omission of works of charity. 5. Execution of the sentence. Thus life and death, good and evil, the blessing and the curse, are set before us, that we may choose our way.—(Dr. THOMAS SCOTT *in loc.* makes excellent practical remarks, but not in the form of hints or short heads.)—D. BROWN: Heaven and hell are suspended upon the treatment of Christ and of those mysterious ministrations to the Lord of glory as disguised in the person of His followers.—True love of Christ goes in search of Him, hastening to embrace and to cherish Him, as He wanders through this bleak and cheerless world in His persecuted *cause* and needy *people.*—To do nothing for Christ is a sufficient cause for condemnation.—(I have examined also the *Fathers* on this section and read through the *Catena Aurea* of THOMAS AQUINAS, but find them far less rich than I expected, and considerably inferior to the practical comments of Protestant expounders above quoted. Some of their views are inserted in the *Exeg. Notes.* Augustine dwells at length on ver. 46 to refute Origen's view of a final salvation of all, even the devil and his angels, and tries to solve the difficulty that the wicked can be capable of suffering bodily and spiritual pain, and yet be incapable of death. Comp. *De civit. Dei,* xxi. 3.)—P. S.]

PART SIXTH.

JESUS in the Consummation of His High-Priesthood; or, the History of the Passion.

CHAPTERS XXVI. AND XXVII.

(Mark xiv. and xv.; Luke xxii. and xxiii.; John xii.-xix.)

The prophetic office of Jesus was historically finished in His eschatological discourses: in the history of His sufferings, His *high-priestly office,* as to its historical aspect, was completed. It was necessary, in the very nature of the case, that the idea of the high-priestly sufferings should be prominent in all the Evangelists; but we find it made specially prominent in the account of Matthew. Thus he lays stress upon the fact, that the fallen priesthood in Israel determined to put Him to death (ch. xxvi. 3, etc.); and he most sharply of all delineates the traitor who delivered Him up. Matthew alone mentions the thirty pieces of silver, as the price of Him who was sold. In Matthew's account of the Supper, and in his alone, it is said that the sacrifice of Jesus availed for His people, εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν (ver. 28). The struggle in Gethsemane is described with particular minuteness; and the threefold repetition of the same prayer is expressly recorded. The reproof of Simon Peter when he drew his sword, the declaration that the twelve legions of angels might be summoned to help—that is, the exhibition of our Lord's voluntary submission at that time—occur in Matthew, and scarcely in any other. (Comp. John xviii. 11.) The suicide of Judas, and the history of the field of blood, are peculiar to Matthew (ch. xxvii. 3-10): as also, Pilate's wife's dream (ver. 19), Pilate's washing of his hands, the people's invocation of the curse on themselves (vers. 24, 25), and specially the blasphemy against Christ on the cross (ver. 43). The rending of the vail of the temple is recorded chiefly by Mark also; but the specific meaning of this

event is unfolded only by Matthew (vers. 51–53). So also is the very important circumstance of the sealing and watch set by the Sanhedrin on the sepulchre. Thus in his Gospel Christ appears from the beginning as sacrificed, and in purpose destroyed by the corrupt high-priesthood; and the signs of propitiation in His death are made sharply prominent. On the other hand, many dramatic traits of the synoptical Gospels are given very briefly by Matthew. Like Mark and Luke, he omits the washing of the feet (John xiii. 1 sqq.), and records instead the institution of the Supper. He passes over the contention of the disciples, Luke xxii. 24; and the further expansion of the warning to Peter, John xiii. 38; Luke xxii. 31. Like them also, he omits the farewell discourses in John. (Mark alone gives the account of the young man who fled, ch. xiv. 51.) Matthew, with the other Synoptists, says nothing of the examination before Annas, John xviii. 13, or of the details of the examination before Pilate, John xviii. 29. He omits also the sending to Herod, which Luke records, ch. xxiii. 7; the scourging, John xix. 1; the transaction between Pilate and the Council concerning the title, "King of the Jews," John xix. 19; the Saviour's words to the weeping women, Luke xxiii. 27; His last saying to His mother, John xix. 25; and the circumstances of John xix. 31, etc.

Of all the words from the cross, Matthew records only the exclamation, "My God, My God!" and he alone makes the observation, that Jesus departed with a loud cry. In these, as in similar traits, Mark approaches him most nearly; but it is very plain that in Matthew the thought of the high-priestly suffering is most strongly impressed upon the whole narrative.

As it respects *the chronology*, the departure of Jesus from the temple, on Tuesday evening, after His great condemning discourse, had introduced the final crisis. We have seen how much more probable it is that Jesus announced on Wednesday to His disciples, that after two days He should be crucified, than that He announced it late on Tuesday evening. This refers the session of the Council, Matt. xxvi. 3, to Wednesday (not to Tuesday night, *Leben Jesu*, ii. 3, p. 1307). From this fixed date the narrative goes back to the anointing in Bethany, which took place some days before—that is, on the evening of the Saturday before Palm Sunday. Then follows the preparation of the Passover on the first day of unleavened bread—that is, on the 14th Nisan, the morning of Thursday, ch. xxvi. 17. On the evening of the 14th Nisan, the beginning of the 15th, comes the Passover itself.

The question here arises, *whether there is any difference between the Synoptists and John in the account of the Passover.** As the Synoptists agree in the statement that Jesus ate the Passover at the legal time with His disciples, it is John who gives rise to a seeming difference; and the discussion of the question might therefore be deferred. It is better, however, to attempt a brief settlement at once.

On the first day of unleavened bread,—that is, on the 14th Nisan,—the paschal feast was, according to Matthew, made ready. On that day the leavened bread was to be removed. On the evening of that

* Comp. on this intricate question WINER: *Realwörterbuch*, sub *Pascha;* DE WETTE, and MEYER: *on John*, xii. 1; xiii. 1; xviii. 28, and the other disputed passages; BLEEK: *Beiträge zur Evangelien-Kritik*, p. 107; WIESELER: *Chronologische Synopse*, p. 389; EBRARD: *Kritik der Evang. Geschichte;* WEIZEL: *Die christliche Paschafeier der ersten Jahrhunderte;* LANGE: *Leben Jesu*, i. p. 187; ii. p. 1166, and *Geschichte des Apost. Zeitalters*, i. p. 71.—[Also GUST. SEYFFARTH: *Chronologia Sacra. Untersuchungen über das Geburtsjahr des Herrn*, Leipz. 1846, pp. 119–148; and among English works, E. GRESWELL: *Dissertations upon the Principles and Arrangement of an Harmony of the Gospels*, 2d ed. Oxf. 1837, 4 vols.; vol. iii. p. 133 sqq.; ALFORD: *Com. on Matt.* xxvi. 17–19 (p. 248 sqq.); ROBINSON: *Harmony*, etc.; SAM. I. ANDREWS: *The Life of our Lord upon the Earth*, New York, 1863, pp. 425–460. Of English writers Andrews, Robinson, and Wordsworth agree with Dr. Lange's view that Christ ate the regular Jewish Passover on Thursday evening, at the close of the 14th of Nisan, and was crucified on Friday the 15th, the first day of the feast; while Greswell, Alford, Ellicott, and others, side with the opposite view according to which Christ instituted the holy communion (either in connection with the real, or a merely anticipatory passover, or a πάσχα μνημονευτικόν, as distinct from the πάσχα θύσιμον, or an ordinary meal—for their views differ in these details) on the 13th of Nisan (Thursday evening), and died on the 14th (Friday afternoon) when the paschal lamb, of which He was the type, was slain and the Jewish Passover proper began. Seyffarth agrees with the latter as to the date of the *month*, but differs from both parties and from the entire tradition of the Christian Church as to the day of the *week*, by putting the crucifixion on a *Thursday* instead of Friday, and by extending the Saviour's rest in the grave to the full extent of three days and three nights till Sunday morning. (*See* below, p. 457.) The chronological difficulty concerning the true date of Christ's death and the true character of His last Supper divides the Greek and Latin Church, but was not made an article of faith in either. The Greek writers generally hold that Christ, as the true Paschal Lamb, was slain at the hour appointed for the sacrifice of the Passover (the 14th of Nisan), and hence the Greek Church uses leavened bread in the Eucharist. The Latin Church, using unleavened bread in the Eucharist, assumes that Christ Himself used it at the institution of this ordinance, and that He ate therefore the true Paschal Supper on the first day of unleavened bread, *i. e.*, the 14th of Nisan, and died on the day following. In this whole controversy it should be constantly kept in mind that the Jewish day commenced six hours before the Julian day, and run from sunset to sunset, or from six o'clock in the evening till six o'clock in the evening, and that the day when Christ instituted the holy communion, embraces the whole history of the passion, crucifixion, and burial.—P. S.]

day, before six o'clock, and thus at the point of transition from the 14th Nisan to the 15th, the legal Passover was introduced by the feet-washing. This explains the representation of John. (1) John xiii. 1–4: "*Before the feast of the Passover, . . . Jesus riseth from supper, and layeth aside His garments*" (that is, to perform the washing). The feast itself began about six o'clock; and it would be very strange if the expression, "before the feast," must be made to mean "a *day* before." It would be much nearer to say, "some *minutes* before;" * but the real meaning is, "an indefinite time previous." (2) John xiii. 27: Jesus said to Judas, "*What thou doest, do quickly;*" and some present thought that he was commanded to go at once, before the opening of the feast, and buy what provisions were necessary for it. But they could not possibly have entertained such a thought, if the whole of the next day had been open to them for the purpose; although it was a very natural one, if the time allowed for secular purposes was fast drawing to a close.† (3) John, ch. xviii. 28, narrates that the Jews, on the morning of the crucifixion, might not enter with Jesus into the Prætorium, "*lest they should be defiled, but that they might eat the Passover*" (ἀλλ' ἵνα φάγωσι τὸ πάσχα). Since the defilement occasioned by entering a Gentile house lasted only one day, they might very well have gone into the Prætorium, and yet eat the Passover after six o'clock; for the defilement would cease at six o'clock in the evening.‡ But, if they had eaten the Passover the evening before, they could not have entered the hall on the morning of the 15th Nisan, lest they should desecrate the paschal feast. John uses here the common and ordinary expression, in the brief form, φαγεῖν § τὸ πάσχα. Wieseler thinks πάσχα an unusual and peculiar form, and understands it of the *Chagigah* [feast-offering] on the 15th Nisan; others refer it to the whole paschal feasts, Deut. xvi. 2; 2 Chron. xxx. 22: "they did eat the paschal feast seven days, offering peace offerings;" but the peculiarity, we think, lies in the φαγεῖν, meaning the continuance of the paschal feast. Examples of such concise expressions are frequent enough, *e. g.*, *to eat fish* for *to fast; to celebrate Christmas* (*Weihnacht*) for *Christmas-day* (*Christtag*), etc.‖ (4) John xix. 31: The Jews urged on the burial of the crucified, that the bodies might not hang upon the crosses on the Sabbath, *the day of preparation.* Wieseler: The day of preparation, παρασκευή, does not signify the preparation before the Passover, but before the first sabbath of the Passover. To the Jews, the Friday was the eve of the Sabbath, or day of preparation; and, if the Passover chanced to begin on a Friday, the next Saturday or Sabbath became a high day, the *great day of the feast.* "That Sabbath was a high day." From this permanent παρασκευή for the Sabbath, John distinguishes a day of preparation for the feast generally, John xiii. 1 and ver. 29.¶—Other reasons alleged in favor of the supposed dif-

* [This is the interpretation of W. Bäumlein, the latest commentator on the fourth Gospel. He explains the πρὸ τῆς ἑορτῆς τοῦ πάσχα *unmittelbar vor dem Paschafeste, i. e., immediately before the Passover.* Compare such expressions as πρὸ δείπνου, πρὸ ἡμέρας. Ewald, however (*Commentar*, p. 343), explains: "AM TAGE VOR *dem Paschafeste, i. e.*, a day before the Passover (the 14th of Nisan).—P. S.]

† [Comp. the same argument more fully stated by ANDREWS: *Life of our Lord*, p. 446.—P. S.]

‡ [LIGHTFOOT, *ad John* xviii. 28, makes the same remark.—P. S.]

§ [The German original reads here and afterward φάγειν for φαγεῖν (infin. from ἔφαγον, used as aor. ii. of ἐσθίω); but the Edinb. trsl. ought not to have copied such an obvious typographical error.—P. S.]

‖ [Comp. the remarks of Andrews *l. c.* p. 447 sqq., who urges that John in six out of the nine times in which he uses the word πάσχα, applies it to the feast generally; that he, writing last of all the Evangelists, speaks of Jewish rites indefinitely as of things now superseded; that therefore the term, *to eat the Passover*, might very well be used by him in a more general sense with reference to the sacrifices which followed the paschal supper on the 14th of Nisan. The most recent commentary on John's Gospel, by W. Bäumlein, Stuttgart, 1863, p. 166, arrives at the same conclusion with Wieseler, that πάσχα here means the חֲגִיגָה or feast offering, *i. e.*, the voluntary sacrifices of sheep or bullock which the Jews offered on the festivals.—P. S.]

¶ [The term: παρασκευή, *preparation*, occurs six times in the Gospels (Matt. xxvii. 62; Mark xv. 42; Luke xxiii. 54; John xix. 14, 31, 42), and in all these cases it means προσάββατον, "the day before the Sabbath," as Mark xv. 42 expressly explains it. So the Germans call Saturday *Sonnabend*, the Sunday-eve. Hence it is equivalent to Friday, and so rendered in Syriac. The Jews observed Friday afternoon from 3 o'clock as the time for preparation for the Sabbath which commenced at sunset (Joseph. *Antiq.* xvi. 6, 2). The only difficulty is with John xix. 14: "*it was the preparation of the Passover*," which Dr Lange should have mentioned before John xix. 31, as an argument urged by the friends of the opposite view, inasmuch as it seems to place the trial and crucifixion *before* the beginning of the Passover. But we have no clear proof that there was a special preparation day for a feast (a Passover eve) as well as for the weekly sabbath; BOCHART, *Hieros.* p. 567: *Sacri scriptores aliam Parasceven seu Præparationem non norunt, quam Sabbati.* And, then, if παρασκευή became the usual term for Friday, the phrase must mean the *Friday of the Passover, i. e.*, the paschal week, according to the wider usage of πάσχα in John. Campbell translates: "Now it was the preparation of the paschal Sabbath;" Norton: "The preparation day of the paschal week." As the 14th of Nisan was universally regarded as the beginning of the Passover, it is very unlikely that John should have gone out of his way to give it the name of the *prepa-*

ference of days are these: (1) Improbability of an execution on a feast day. Against this we have Rabbi Akiba: Great transgressors were taken to Jerusalem, in order that they might be put to death at the feast, before the eyes of the people (according to Deut. xvii. 12, 13). Executions had a religious character. They were symbols of judgment, for warning and edification. Sad analogies are the Spanish *auto da fés* as popular religious festivals.* (2) The women prepared their spices on the day of Jesus' death. But we answer that on the mere feast days (not Sabbaths) spices might be prepared, and other things might be done: labor only was excluded (Lev. xxiii. 7, 8). (3) The Synoptists as well as John describe the day of Christ's death as παρασκευή and προσάββατον. We answer that the second of these terms simply proves the day to have been Friday.—Thus all the evidences brought forward to support the theory of a difference in the days may be used on the opposite side.

In addition to this we must urge the following positive reasons in favor of our view: 1. It cannot be conceived that Jesus, led always by the Father through the path of legal ordinance, would celebrate the paschal feast a day before the time, and thereby *voluntarily* hasten His own death. 2. Pilate releases a prisoner to the Jews ἐν τῷ πάσχα, John xviii. 39. 3. John, according to the testimony of the *Quartodecimans* of the Easter controversy, kept the feast on the evening of the 14th Nisan, and therefore at the same time with the Jews. 4. The argument used by the Fathers, Clemens and Hippolytus, against the *Quartodecimans*, that Jesus died on the legal day of the Passover, *because He was the real Passover*, may be made to support the claim for the 15th Nisan (although there is an evident confusion among these fathers in the counting of the days, and too much stress laid on the fact that the paschal lamb was slain on the 14th Nisan).† If Jesus died on the 15th Nisan, He died on the day of the legal Passover; for that day began at six o'clock of the 14th Nisan. If, on the other hand, it was at three o'clock in the afternoon of 14th Nisan that He died, it would have been one day before the legal paschal day, which did not begin till six o'clock. Neglect of the difference between the Jewish and the Roman (and our own) reckoning from midnight has tended much to confuse this question.

The chronological difference in the account of the Evangelists has been maintained by Bretschneider, Usteri, Theile, de Wette, Meyer, Lücke, Bleek, Ebrard, and many others, who decide the question, some in favor of the Synoptists, some in favor of John. On the other hand, the agreement of John with the other three has been established by Hengstenberg, Tholuck, Wieseler, and, temporarily, by Ebrard.‡ Others, again, have striven to explain the Synoptists according to the *supposed* meaning of John; among the more recent writers Movers, Krafft, and Maier [of Freiburg, in his *Commentar über das Evangelium des Johannes*, p. 280 sqq.—not to be confounded with the Protestant Meyer so often quoted in this work]. The latter urges that, according to John, the meal of which the Lord partook fell upon the evening of the 13th Nisan. The term ἐν πρώτῃ τῶν ἀζύμων, in the Synoptists, is then explained by the custom of the Galileans; according to which the whole preparation day of the feast, the 14th Nisan,

ration for the Passover in the sense of Passover eve. Tholuck and Wieseler quote from Ignatius *ad Phil.* c. 13, the expression: σάββατον τοῦ πάσχα, and from Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* v. 22: σάββατον τῆς ἑορτῆς. Bäumlein *in loc.*: "*Es ist der Rüsttag der Paschazeit; denn wie wir gesehen haben,* τὸ πάσχα *bezeichnet bei Johannes die ganze Paschafestzeit. Johannes wollte hervorheben, an welchem* WOCHENTAGE *der Paschazeit Jesus gekreuzigt ward, wie nachher hervorgehoben wird, dass die Auferstehung auf den ersten Tag der Woche, also den dritten Tag nach der Kreuzigung fiel.*" To this we may add the higher reason that John wished to expose the awful inconsistency and crime of the Jews in putting the Saviour to death on the very day when they should have prepared themselves for the service of God in His temple on the coming sabbath doubly sacred by its connection with the great Passover.—P. S.]

* [It may be added that the Jews attempted several times to seize Jesus on sabbaths or festival days, Luke iv. 26, 29 (on a sabbath); John vii. 30, 32 (in the midst of the feast of tabernacles, τῆς ἑορτῆς μεσούσης, ver. 14); vii. 37, 44, 45 (on the last day of the feast); x. 22, 39 (at the feast of the dedication).—P. S.]

† [The church fathers have the tradition that Christ died on the viii. Cal. Apriles, *i. e.*, on the 25th of March, three days after the vernal equinox. The most definite testimony is that of Tertullian, which may be turned, however, against the view of Dr. Lange: "*Quæ passio facta est sub Tiberio Cæsare, Consulibus Rubellio Gemino et Fusio Gemino, mense Martio, temporibus Paschæ, die viii. Calend. Aprilium, die primo azumorum* [*this seems to be the* 14*th of Nisan, as in Matt. xxvi.* 17 *and parallels*], *quo agnum ut occiderent ad vesperam, a Moyse fuerat præceptum.*" *Adv. Jud.* 8. *De Bapt.* c. 19.—P. S.]

‡ [Ebrard held originally the other view, that Christ died on the 14th of Nisan, and was rather suddenly converted to the opposite side by Wieseler (*Chronol. Synopse*, Hamburg, 1843, pp. 333–390), but then he again returned to his first view in consequence of the clear, calm, and thorough investigation of Bleek (*Beiträge zur Evangelien-Kritik*, Berlin, 1846, pp. 107–156). Comp. EBRARD: *Das Evangelium Johannis*, p. 42 sqq., where he defends Wieseler's view, and his *Wissenschaftliche Kritik der Evang. Geschichte*, 2d ed. 1850, p. 506 sqq., where he returns to his first view with the honest confession: "The plausible and acute arguments of Wieseler have since been so thoroughly refuted by Bleek that no false pride of consistency can prevent me from returning openly to my original opinion as expressed in the first edition of this work."—P. S.]

had been already kept. "According to their custom, this day fell into the Passover season, and might, as including the last part of the 13th Nisan, when the leaven was removed, be described as πρώτη τῶν ἀζύμων." Thus he explains Matthew as meaning that the meal, no proper Passover, took place on the evening of the 13th Nisan. But this is untenable. For, 1. Maier himself acknowledges that Mark and Luke expressly describe the Lord's meal as a Passover celebrated at the legal time; and it is highly improbable that Matthew would here place himself on the side of John, in opposition to Mark and Luke. 2. The circumstance, that the Galileans removed the leaven earlier than the Jews—so soon as the morning of the 14th Nisan, even the evening before—may be accounted for by the obligations of their journey. They came as travellers and guests to Jerusalem, and were therefore obliged to fix an earlier time for the beginning of the preparation. But it was not possible that they should begin the feast of unleavened bread a day earlier, because this would have been opposed to all Jewish ordinance, and because they must in that case, during that whole day, have avoided all social intercourse with the Jews. 3. Jesus is said to have anticipated the day, because He foresaw His own death. But Jesus also foresaw that the betrayal of Judas would be connected with the Passover. 4. It is plain that Matthew speaks of a legal Passover which could not be anticipated; for the disciples remind the Lord that the time of the Passover was at hand. Matthew does not say that the first day of the feast of unleavened bread was approaching, but that it was come.—On other artificial attempts at reconciliation, *see* Winer, *Reallexicon*, art. *Pascha.*

All the Evangelists plainly agree in recording that Christ rose again on a *Sunday*, that He lay during the preceding *Sabbath* in the sepulchre, and that He died on the *Friday* before this Sabbath. According to Wieseler (p. 386 sqq.), Jesus was crucified on the 15th of Nisan of the year 30 A. D., or 783 from the foundation of Rome; and that day was a Friday.

[I call attention here to a different view on the day of Christ's death, not hitherto noticed by commentators, but worthy of a respectful examination. Dr. Gustav Seyffarth, formerly professor extraordinary in the university of Leipzig, now residing in New York, the author of a number of learned works on Egyptiology, Astronomy, and Chronology, and the propounder of a new theory of the Egyptian hieroglyphics (*see* his *Grammatica Ægyptiaca; Theologische Schriften der alten Ægypter*, etc.), deviates from the traditional view, and holds that Christ died on *Thursday*, the 14th (not the 15th) of Nisan (the 19th of March), and lay full three days and three nights in the grave till Sunday morning. *See* his *Chronologia Sacra*, Leipzig, p. viii. sq. and p. 120 sqq. He thus solves the difficulty concerning the three days and three nights which the Saviour was to lay in the grave according to repeated statements, Matt. xii. 40 (τρεῖς ἡμέρας καὶ τρεῖς νύκτας); xxvii. 63 (μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας); John ii. 19 (ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις); Apoc. xi. 9 (ἡμέρας τρεῖς). Dr. Seyffarth supports this view also by astronomical calculations of the eclipse of the sun at the death of our Saviour, into the details of which I cannot here follow him. In fact, he bases ancient chronology largely on astronomy. As to the year of Christ's death, Dr. Seyffarth, considering the Æra Dionysiaca correct in the date of the year and the day of Christ's birth, puts it the year 33 *post Christum natum*, or 787 *Anno Urbis.* Other dates of Christ's death assigned by various writers are: A. U. 783 (Wieseler, Friedlieb, Tischendorf, Greswell, Ellicott, Lange, Andrews); 781 (Jarvis); 782 (Browne, Sepp, Clinton); 786 (Ebrard, Ewald).—P. S.]

The Meaning of the Sufferings and Death of Jesus.—Here is the sacred centre of history, the history of histories, the end and the summing up of all past time, the beginning and the summing up of all the new ages, the perfected judgment, and the perfected redemption. Therefore, also, it is a perfected revelation: it is the supreme revelation of Jesus and of the depths of His heart; of the deep things of the Godhead; of the divine wisdom, righteousness, and grace; of the depths of humanity, the most manifold characteristics of which are here laid bare in the contrast between the holy Son of Man and the sinful children of men; the depths of nature, living and suffering in fellowship with humanity; the deep things of the spiritual world, and the depths of Satan. As it is said in Isa. liii., concerning the Redeemer: "Who shall declare His length of life?" so it may here be said: "Who shall declare the depths of His death?"

We can only hint here at the riches of the contrasts—revealing the fulness of the revelation of judgment and redemption—which the history of our Lord's passion includes. 1. The contrast of the sufferings of Christ with His last eschatological predictions concerning His own future judicial majesty. Chrysostom: "At the fitting time He speaks now of His sufferings, when His future kingdom, with its rewards and punishments, was so present to His thoughts." 2. The contrast of His passion with His past official work in life: suffering as the counterpart of action, passive obedience of active. Lisco: "The history of the Redeemer's passion is related at large, and with peculiar preference, by the Evangelists. In His sufferings (as in His actions) the God-man reveals Himself in His dignity and glory.

But while the *active* virtues exhibit themselves in His whole life, the no less great virtues of patience, gentleness, longsuffering, and supreme submission to God, prominently express themselves in His sufferings. These were not so much the consequence of the cunning, malice, and power of His enemies, as His own free-will offering for the redemption of a sinful world: in this He manifested Himself as the innocent and patient Lamb of God, bearing and putting away the sins of the world in obedience to His heavenly Father. The suffering, dying, and victoriously rising Redeemer, amidst all the diversified concomitants of His passion, gives us a perfect image of the great conflict between the kingdoms of light and of darkness. Far from all passionless indifference, the Redeemer exhibited in His sufferings the tender emotions of sorrow and grief, and even of anguish and fear—thus becoming to us also a symbol of that endurance of suffering which is well-pleasing to God." 3. The contrast of the perfected passion to the suffering course of His whole life. 4. The contrast between the great fulfilment, and the types and the predictions concerning the suffering Messiah (Ps. xxii.; Isa. liii.). 5. The contrast with the ancient martyrs from the blood of Abel downward. 6. The contrast between the woes of Christ and the sorrows and pleasures of the old world. 7. The contrast of His passion with His original divine glory, and his final human glorification.—A new series of such antitheses is then opened in the contrast of the sufferings of the personal Christ with the sufferings of His people, with the contrast of death and resurrection, to the end of the world. And, on the other side, there are the contrasts of reconciliation: the reconciliation of God and man, of heaven and earth, of this world and the next, of life and death, of the crown and the cross, of judgment and mercy. Heubner: "The history of the passion is the highest and holiest history; it is the turning-point in the history of the world, both in itself, and its design and effect."

In the *homiletical* treatment of this event care should ever be taken not to forget the central-point, the Lord Himself, while contemplating the prominent figures surrounding Him. The suffering Redeemer Himself is always the essential object in every section:—the point of view from which to regard all the other persons, Judas, Peter, Pilate, and the rest, who must be seen in the light which He sheds upon them. Then, also, we should remember to regard these guilty and failing characters not with feelings of human excitement, and the rage of judicial revenge against Pilate and Judas (as in the Ash-Wednesday services of mediæval Catholicism), but in the spirit of conciliation which the atoning sacrifice before us suggests. And, lastly, the redeeming power of the victorious love of Christ should be supreme in our thoughts; from it we should derive our arguments and pleas.

LITERATURE on the History of Christ's Passion.*—*See* full lists of works in LILIENTHAL: *Bibl. Archivarius*, 1745, p. 118 sqq.; DANZ: *Wörterbuch der theol. Literatur*, p. 782, and *Supplement*, p. 80; WINER: *Handbuch der theol. Literatur*, ii. p. 155, *Supplement*, p. 258; HEUBNER, p. 876.—We mention the following: HUGO GROTIUS: *Christus Patiens*, a Latin drama, 1616; KLOPSTOCK: *Messias* (heroic poem); LAVATER: *Pontius Pilatus*; RAMBACH: *Meditations on the Whole History of Christ's Passion* (German), Berlin, 1742; RIEGER: *Sermons on the Passion* (German), Stuttgart, 1751; CALLISEN: *The Last Days of our Lord* (German), Nürnberg, 1823; F. W. KRUMMACHER: *The Suffering Saviour*, Bielefeld, 1854 [English translation, Boston, 1857]; J. WICHELHAUS: *A complete Commentary on the History of Christ's Passion* (German), Halle, 1855. [I. H. FRIEDLIEB: *Archæology of the History of the Passion*, Bonn, 1848; W. STROUD: *Physical Cause of the Death of Christ*, London, 1847; the relevant sections in the *Lives of Christ* by HASE, NEANDER SEPP, LANGE, LICHTENSTEIN, EBRARD, EWALD, RIGGENBACH, BAUMGARTEN, VAN OOSTERZEE, KITTO, ELLICOTT, ANDREWS. On the *doctrinal* aspect of the History of the Passion, compare also W. MAGEE (archbishop of Dublin, †1831): *Discourses and Dissertations on the Scriptural Doctrines of Atonement and Sacrifice*, 1801 and often (*Works*, London, 1842, vol. 1st).—P. S.]

On the development of the Catholic celebration of the Passion of Christ during Lent and the Holy Week to Good Friday, we refer to the archæological works of AUGUSTI and RHEINWALD [BINGHAM, BINTERIM]; also to FR. STRAUSS: *The Evangelical Church-Year* (German), p. 177, and LISCO: *The Christian Church-Year* (German), p. 19, etc.

* [All omitted in the Edinb. trsl.—P. S.]

FIRST SECTION.

THE CERTITUDE OF CHRIST, AND THE INCERTITUDE OF HIS ENEMIES. THE DIVINE COUNSEL: AT THE FEAST OF THE PASSOVER.

CHAPTER XXVI. 1–5.

(Mark xiv. 1, 2; Luke xxii. 1, 2.)

1 And it came to pass, when Jesus had finished all these sayings, he said unto his dis-
2 ciples, Ye know that after two days is *the feast of* the passover [comes the passover, τὸ
3 πάσχα γίνεται], and the Son of man is betrayed [delivered up][1] to be crucified. Then

assembled together the chief priests, and the scribes,[2] and the elders of the people, unto
4 the palace [in the court, αὐλή][3] of the high priest, who was called Caiaphas, And con-
sulted [together, συνεβουλεύσαντο] that they might take Jesus by subtilty [craft,
5 δόλῳ], and kill *him* [put him to death]. But they said, Not on the feast *day* [at the
feast, ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ],[4] lest there be an uproar [tumult, θόρυβος] among the people.

[1] Ver. 2.—[So Lange renders παραδίδοται here. Comp. ch. v. 25; xv. 5; xviii. 34; xxvii. 18, 26; Mark xv. 1; Luke xx. 20; Rom. viii. 32. But παραδιδόναι is used sometimes, like προδιδόναι and the Lat. *prodere*, with the collateral notion of *treachery*, as in ch. x. 4.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 3.—Καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς (*and the scribes*) must be omitted according to Codd. A., B., D., L., etc. Probably inserted from Mark xiv. 1; Luke xxii. 2. [The words are also wanting in Cod. Sinait. and in the critical editions.]

[3] Ver. 3.—[Dr. Lange: *Halle*. Αὐλή means usually, and so here, not the *palace*, but the *atrium*, the inner court, or enclosed square around which the house was built, and which was used also for business. This is evident from ver. 69: Πέτρος ἐκάθητο ἔξω ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ, *sat without in the court* (not: *without in the palace*, which involves a contradiction in terms), and from Luke xxii. 55, where it is said that they kindled a fire ἐν μέσῳ τῆς αὐλῆς, *in midst of the court*. Comp. Meyer and Conant *in loc.*, and Lange's *Exeg. Notes*.—P. S.]

[4] Ver. 5.—[The word *feast* here means the whole period of seven days during which the passover lasted. Meyer: *Sie meinen die ganze siebentägige Festzeit*.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1. **Had ended all these sayings.**—With these sayings [ch. xxiv. and xxv.] the Lord completed His historical prophetic office. He now forannounces the fulfilment of His priestly office. He has marked out the figure of His future, the Son of Man in His majesty and glory. This assurance is the basis on which He stands at the commencement of His sufferings and deepest humiliation, and the basis on which He seeks to place His disciples.

Ver. 2. **After two days.**—[*Day after to-morrow*, on Thursday.] *See* the introductory remarks on the chronology of the history of the Passion.

The Passover.—פֶּסַח, Aram. פַּסְחָא; according to Ex. xii. 13, from פָּסַח, *to pass over*, *to spare*, with allusion to the sparing of the first-born of Israel when the first-born of Egypt were slain by the destroying angel: thus, *the passing over* (of the destroying angel).* This passing over has a threefold meaning: 1. The deliverance of the people out of Egypt through the judgment upon the Egyptians—the typical redemption; 2. the spiritual offering up of the Israelite first-born with the Egyptian, expressed by the blood of the lamb sprinkled on the door-posts—the typical death of Christ; 3. the actual sparing of the Israelite first-born in connection with that sacrifice—the raising up of the new life of Christ out of the sacrificial death. Accordingly, the Passover is a feast of thank-offering, a peace-offering, a sacrifice of salvation, which rests upon the basis of a sacrifice devoted to curse (the death of the Egyptian first-born), and of a propitiatory sacrifice (the sacrifice of the Israelite first-born in the blood of the lamb). The feast of deliverance is the seal and sacrament of salvation, the festival of new life and redemption, won out of the judgment of death. The type has thus its threefold relation to Christ. As Christ in His life was the true burnt-offering, so in His death He was: 1. The sacrifice of curse *cherem* (Gal. iii. 13), through the blindness of the world and the judgment of God, in order to the awakening and spiritual judgment of the world; 2. the sin-offering, *chattah* (2 Cor. v. 21), for the reconciliation of the world; 3. the thank-offering in the new life, in the infinite fulness of life which He obtained in death. In all these senses He was the true and real Passover (1 Cor. v. 7); and Easter, but especially the holy Supper, is the New Testament paschal feast, the feast of salvation, grounded upon propitiation through the condemnation of sin. And, inasmuch as with the deliverance from Egypt was connected separation from the leaven of Egyptian idolatry, and disciplinary wandering through the desert, the Passover is at the same time the feast of unleavened bread (חַג הַמַּצּוֹת). This view of the feast has two main points: 1. Separation from the leaven, the spiritual fellowship of Egypt (Matt. xvi. 6; 1 Cor. v. 7); 2. wandering through all the tests and discipline of privation in the wilderness (Deut. xvi. 3). With this twofold religious significance of the feast, there was, in process of time, connected the festival of spring-time and the beginning of harvest, or the first-fruits. (Some modern archæologists have without cause reversed the order, and made the natural feast the basis of the churchly or spiritual. Compare Winer, sub *Pascha*.) The Passover was the first of the three great feasts of Israel, and was celebrated in the first month of the year, Abib or Nisan, about the time of full moon—from the 14th to the 21st of Nisan—and in the central sanctuary. Concerning its rites, *see* below.

* [The word πάσχα (originally *transitus*, ὑπέρβασις, פֶּסַח) is used in a threefold sense in the N. T. (1) *Agnus paschalis*, the paschal lamb; hence the phrase *to kill the passover*, Mark xiv. 12; Luke xxii. 7. (2) The sacrificial lamb *and the supper*, Matt. xxvi. 17; Mark xiv. 14; Luke xxii. 11. (3) The *whole feast* of unleavened bread, ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν ἀζύμων, or τὰ ἄζυμα, which lasted seven days, Matt. xxvi. 2; Luke xxii. 1, and so generally in John ii. 13; vi. 4; xi. 15; xii. 1; xiii. 1, etc. Some of the Greek and Latin fathers connected the *passover* with the Greek verb πάσχω, *to suffer*, and with the death of Christ which was typified by the sacrifice of the paschal lamb Dr. Wordsworth finds a deep mystic meaning in this,—a mistake, which evidently arose from the ignorance of Hebrew, a language known to very few of the fathers and schoolmen down to the period of the Reformation. He also sees a providential paronomasia in Luke xxii. 15 between τοῦτο τὸ πάσχα φαγεῖν and πρὸ τοῦ με παθεῖν.—P. S.]

And the Son of Man is delivered up to be crucified.—The predictions of the crucifixion generally are here taken for granted: the prophecy here specifically lies in the definition of the date.

Ver. 3. **Then assembled together.**—To the clear prospect and certitude of the Lord concerning the period of His death, is characteristically opposed the perfect uncertainty of the Sanhedrin concerning it, and the decree, which circumstances soon rendered vain, "*not on the feast-day*."

In the court [*in der Halle*].—Not the palace of the high-priest itself, but the *atrium*, or court en-

closed by its buildings. The common place of meeting for the Sanhedrin was called *Gazith*, and joined, according to the Talmud, the south side of the temple. Lightfoot, p. 459.*

Who was called Caiaphas.—"Probably equivalent to כֵּיפָא, *depressio.*" This was a standing surname, which passed into a proper name. He was originally called *Joseph* (Joseph. *Antiq.* xviii. 2, 2). [Some ancient fathers confounded him with Josephus the Jewish historian, and supposed that he was secretly converted to Christianity.—P. S.] Caiaphas was one of those high-priests who marked the desecration of the institution by party spirit and the influence of foreign power. The Procurator Valerius Gratus had given him the office, and he lost its dignity through Vitellius (Joseph. *Antiq.* xviii. 2, 2; 4, 3). He was the son-in-law of Annas. The evangelical history paints his character in his deeds.

Ver. 4. **By craft,** δόλῳ.—The impression which the spiritual victories gained over them in the temple by Jesus had made upon the people, and also upon themselves, is here very plainly marked.

Not at the feast.—The people were, in their congregation at the feast (often to the amount of two millions), generally inclined to insurrection (Joseph. *Antiq.* xvii. 9, 3; xx. 5, 3); and a tumult on behalf of Jesus was all the more to be provided against, because He had so many dependents among the people, especially among the bold and quarrelsome mountaineers from Galilee. The decree was presently invalidated—not through the first offer of Judas (Meyer), which had already been made, and had led them to settle the form of betrayal and His sudden surprise—but through the later appearance of the traitor, when he came from the supper in the night, and announced to them the favorable opportunity of seizing Christ in the garden. Bengel: *Sic consilium divinum successit.* Their counsel was fulfilled only so far as the taking the Lord by craft. It was a vain imagination that such a person as Jesus was, could be surreptitiously and without noise removed out of the way.

[Comp. Wordsworth: "Observe Christ's power over His enemies in His death. Oftentimes when they endeavored to take Him, He escaped from them (John x. 39). But at the time when they had desired not to take Him, viz., at the Passover (comp. Luke xxii. 6), then He willed to be taken, and they, though unwilling, took Him; and so they fulfilled the prophecies in killing Him who is the true Passover, and in proving Him to be the Christ. (Comp. Leo, *Serm.* lviii.; Theophylact *in Marc.* xiv. 2.)" Dr. Lange, Meyer, Wordsworth, and others, assume that the priests intended to crucify the Lord *after* the feast of the Passover, when the crowds of strangers, sometimes amounting to two millions, should have left, but were frustrated in their design by the favorable opportunity soon offered. Ewald, on the contrary (*Geschichte Christus'*, p. 410), supposes that they intended to crucify Him *before* the feast, and actually did so, viz., on the 14th of Nisan. There is no doubt that the words μὴ ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ, *not at the feast!* admit of both views. But in the latter case we would involve the Synoptists in self-contradiction; and then the time was already so far advanced, that the people, whose tumult they feared, must have already been at Jerusalem when the Sanhedrin resolved to crucify Christ. In any case their words in ver. 5 imply that they had no *religious* scruples against a public execution on the feast, but were restrained only by motives of policy and expediency. Probably such executions *did* take place sometimes on high festivals—as religious acts, and as a warning to the people. The law nowhere expressly prohibits them. Hegesippus relates in Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* ii. 23, that James the Just, the brother of the Lord, was stoned and killed on the day of the Passover. *See* above, p. 456. Consequently this verse cannot be pressed as an argument against the view that Christ died on the 15th of Nisan, as is done by Bleek and others who advocate the 14th as the day of the crucifixion. —P. S.]

* [Comp. Crit. Note, No. 3, above, p. 459.—P. S.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. Jesus in divine assurance ready for death, familiar with the time of His death; while His murderers themselves know not whither they are proceeding.

2. Jesus the real Passover, or Paschal Lamb. *See* above.

3. The Sanhedrin, in its decree: "*Not on the feast*," is the type of the policy of a sinful world, which is violently moved by the powers of hell, and urged whither they will more impetuously than itself desires.

4. In the way of obedience, Jesus came to the feast of the Passover. He was separated from the temple, but not from His people and His religious obligations and customs. As an Israelite, He must keep the feast in Jerusalem; although this feast should result in His own death. And this very fact makes it an untenable notion, that Jesus kept the Passover a day earlier than was the custom. He would then have arbitrarily altered and belied at the end the legal propriety of His whole life. His submission to the law brought Him to His death. Concerning the high-priestly office of Christ, compare dogmatical treatises.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Christ, in the full anticipation of His judicial glory, is prepared for His death: 1. He is *notwithstanding* ready for death; 2. He is *on that account* ready for death.—The divine assurance of the Lord, in contrast with the perfect and helpless uncertainty of His enemies: 1. The fact itself: (*a*) He as the sacrifice knows the day of His death, which the murderers themselves do not yet know; (*b*) He marks out a definite day, which they by their decree in council reject. 2. The explanation of the fact: (*a*) Christ is perfectly familiar with the spirit of Scripture (the meaning of the ancient Passover)—with the government of His Father (He knows the machinations of the powers of evil to which His enemies are given over); (*b*) His enemies suppose in their despotic counsels that they are above events, while they have become the helpless instruments of hell; (*c*) hell itself knows not all things, and knows wrongly all that it knows; it is decreed by God that it shall be now condemned.—What is it that the Lord lays most stress upon when He announces His passion? 1. Not that He should be nailed to the cross; but, 2. that He should be betrayed.—Perfect truth mourning over perfect falsehood in the deepest grief.—The sufferings of Christ the consummation of all Joseph's sufferings: to be *betrayed* and *sold* by His brethren.—The uncounselled

confusion of the High Council.—The mixing up of politics with the Church must ruin both.—The last sittings of the Jewish ruling Council in the Church, according to Matthew: 1. A council without counsel* devoted to subtilty (ch. xxvi. 5); 2. a shameless council, devoted to lying and calumniation (ch. xxvii. 1); 3. a profligate council, devoted to hypocrisy (ver. 7); 4. a blind council, devoted to bribery (ch. xxviii. 12).—The greatest of all insurrections (against the Lord's Anointed) must always be in dread of the phantom of insurrection: 1. They lift themselves up against the Lord; and, 2. brand the possible uprising for His defence as rebellion.—The shallow farce of hierarchical pride condemned: 1. They think they can triumphantly trifle,—(*a*) with circumstances; (*b*) with men; (*c*) with sin. 2. They become a spectacle of judgment,—(*a*) through unforeseen accident; (*b*) through the spirits of hell (working in the soul of Judas); (*c*) through the sacred supervision of God. —The counsel of the wicked set at nought: 1. It half succeeds (they take the Lord with subtilty); 2. it seemed to have succeeded beyond expectation (the people made an insurrection in *their* favor at the feast); 3. but it was absolutely put to shame (the crucifixion of Christ at this feast was the end of all their feasts).—The warning thought, that the obduracy of the Jews reached its climax precisely at the feasts, when Jesus came to them—The question, whether Christ should die at the feast? The enemies say: "Not at the feast;" the Lord says: "On the feast-day, and no other." † The corruption of the Jewish feasts, out of which the great Christian feasts have sprung: Good Friday, Easter, Ascension Day, and Whitsuntide.—The counsel of God, that Christ should die at the feast of the Passover. 1. The appointment: (*a*) in the holiest place of the earth; (*b*) at the highest feast; (*c*) in the midst of an assembly which represented the whole of mankind; (*d*) thus with perfect publicity. 2. The reason: (*a*) for the realization of all the symbols, especially the Passover; (*b*) to establish that the feast of the typical deliverance was changed into the feast of the real redemption; (*c*) for a manifestation of the judgment of the world, and of the reconciliation of the world, in the greatest assembly of Jews and Gentiles. —God can make sacrifices of His own, but He does not give them up to secret murder.—They might crucify Him openly before all the world; but secretly do away with Him they could not.—The blood of the saints does not sink silently into the ground; it publicly flows, and preaches aloud.

Starke:—Christ's words inseparable from His sufferings.—Happy he who, when his death comes, can speak and hear about it with satisfaction.—Christ would suffer and die at the Passover: 1. Because the paschal lamb was a type of Himself, 1 Cor. v. 7; 2. that His sufferings and death might the sooner be everywhere known.—*Zeisius*:—In the first Passover, the Israelites were brought out of the literal slavery of Egypt; in the last Passover, Christ has delivered us by His death from spiritual slavery, Titus ii. 14, 15.—Christ delighted to speak of His sufferings; let us delight in hearing of them, especially during Lent.—The great mass of the High Council are spoken of (Nicodemus, Joseph of Arimathea, and some others, were excepted): happy those who do not make themselves partakers of the sins committed in the fraternity of their colleagues.—*Bibl. Würt.*:—The worst wickedness is practised at the most holy times: men never play and debauch themselves, and rage more in iniquity, than on the feast-days; but what on other days is simple sin, on such days is ten fold.—*Canstein*:—The visible Church of Christ may reach such a point, that its most eminent and greatest members may not only not tolerate Christ and His truth, but even seek to destroy them.—*Quesnel*: —The human schemes, Gen. l. 20.—*Canstein*:—The ancient hypocritical serpent-subtilty (ver. 4, by subtilty), Gen. iii. 15.—*Zeisius*:—The world can bear with Jews, Gentiles, Turks, Epicureans, but not with the honest witnesses of truth.—The Messiah was to suffer and die in the midst of a great multitude of people.—*Cramer*:—The counsel of the ungodly passes away, but the decree of God shall stand.—Unpriestly priests,* who, instead of attending to devotion, are dealing in political and ofttimes diabolical schemes.

Heubner:—*All these sayings* (ver. 1). He had told His people and His disciples all that was needful for salvation, and had confirmed all by works and miracles: nothing now was left but to die.—He spoke of His sufferings, that His disciples might see how little chance had to do with them, but that all was after the will of His heavenly Father.—A pattern to us, that we should accustom ourselves to think and speak without fear of our final sufferings.—They thought not that He well knew all that was passing in their council.—The higher a man rises in influence and authority, the greater is his temptation to ambition, pride, love of power, and envy.—Those who are mighty in this world, its great men and rulers, are mostly indisposed to any new and better ordinance. —Fear of the people: vigor and openness are peculiar to the righteous cause.—"Not at the feast:" the feast was the wrong time, not because of any fear of God, but because of their fear of man. The decree must have cost them after all some pangs of conscience.

* [*Ein rathloser Rath—ein schamloser Rath—ein ruchloser Rath—ein sinnloser Rath.*—]

† [This theme, of course, implies the chronological view held by Lange, Tholuck, Wieseler, and Hengstenberg, who fix upon the 15th Nisan as the day of crucifixion; but it is of no avail if Christ died on the 14th Nisan or before the regular Jewish Passover, according to Seyffarth, Ebrard, Bleek, and others.—P. S.]

* [This comes nearer the original: *Geistlose Geistliche*, than the Edinb. trsl.: *Unspiritual clerics.*—P. S.]

SECOND SECTION.

THE ANOINTING AT BETHANY.

Chapter XXVI. 6–16.

(Mark xiv. 3–11; Luke xxii. 3–6; John xii. 1–8.)

6 Now when Jesus was in Bethany, in the house of Simon the leper [**four days previous,**
7 **on Saturday**], There came unto him a woman having an alabaster box of very precious
ointment, and poured it on his head, as he sat at meat [reclined at table, **ἀνακειμένου**].
8 But when his [the][1] disciples saw *it*, they had indignation [were indignant, or displeas-
9 ed, ἠγανάκτησαν], saying, To what purpose *is* this waste? For this ointment[2] might
10 have been sold for much, and given to the poor. When Jesus understood *it*, he [And
Jesus knowing it, γνοὺς δὲ ὁ Ἰησ.] said unto them, Why trouble ye the woman? for she
11 hath wrought a good work upon me. For ye have the poor [the poor ye have, τοὺς
12 πτωχοὺς ἔχετε] always with you; but me ye have not always. For in that she hath
poured [in pouring, βαλοῦσα] this ointment on my body, she did *it* for my burial
13 [for my embalmment, or to prepare for my burial, πρὸς τὸ ἐνταφιάσαι με]. Verily I
say unto you, Wheresoever this gospel shall be preached in the whole world, *there*
shall also this, that this woman hath done [this also that she hath done, καὶ ὃ ἐποίησεν
14 αὕτη], be told for a memorial of her. Then one of the twelve, called Judas Iscariot,
15 went unto the chief priests, And said *unto them*, What will ye give me, and I will de-
liver him unto you? And they covenanted with him for [promised him][3] thirty pieces
16 [shekels] of silver.[4] And from that time he sought opportunity to betray him.

[1] Ver. 8.—*The* for *His*; αὐτοῦ being omitted here and ver. 45 by the best authorities.

[2] Ver. 9.—A., B., D., L., and other MSS., omit τὸ μύρον, *ointment*. [So also Cod. Sinait. which reads simply τοῦτο.]

[3] Ver. 15.—[Dr. Lange translates ἔστησαν αὐτῷ: *sie setzten ihm aus*, i. e., they appointed or fixed upon that price for him, they secured or promised him. So Vulgata, Jerome (*in loc.*), Theophylact, Luther, E. V., Grotius, Elsner, Fritzsche, Alford, etc. The other translation is: *they weighed out to him*. So Euthym., Beza, Wahl (*appendo, zuwägen, darwägen*, Matt. xxvi. 15), Bretschneider, Kuinoel, de Wette, Ewald, Meyer (*see* quotation in the *Exeg. Notes*), Robinson, T. J. Conant, Wordsworth, etc. Comp. the *Lexica*, sub ἵστημι; Wetstein *in loc.*; Winer, *B. R. W. B.*, sub *Geld*; and Valckenær *ad Eurip. Fragm.* p. 288: "*Qui lances æquato sustinebat examine, cujuscunque rei pondus ad libram æstimaturus, dicebatur eximie* ἱστᾶν *etiam veteribus, Herodoto ii. p.* 135, 89, *Platoni De Republ. x. p.* 602. D. . . *Interpres Jobi xxxvi.* 6, ἱστᾷ με ἐν ζυγῷ δικαίῳ." Compare, however, Dr. Lange's objection to Meyer's explanation in the *Exeg. Notes*. To this may be added that the συνέθεντο of Luke and the ἐπηγγείλατο of Mark are rather in favor of the first translation.—P. S.]

[4] Ver. 15.—[Dr. Lange inserts here *shekels of silver*. The τριάκοντα ἀργύρια were probably sacred shekels, which were heavier than the common shekels, and hence paid by weight.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 6. **Now, when Jesus was in Bethany,** or lit.: **And Jesus being in B.**—On the Saturday before [six days before the Passover, *see* John xii. 1]. Meyer, indeed, thinks that to remove this abode of Jesus at Bethany before the note of time, ver. 2, is a device of the Harmonists, from which the τότε of ver. 14 should have deterred them. Certainly that would be true if this τότε were found in ver. 6. But the τότε in ver. 14 manifestly refers to the previous anointing. A similar retrogression to an earlier event may be found in Matt. xiv. 3; as an anticipation in ch. xxvii. 7, where Meyer himself is obliged to give up the external succession.*

* [Wordsworth: "An instance of *recapitulation*. This incident took place before our Lord's betrayal, but St. Matthew introduces it here to mark the *contrast* between *Mary* and *Judas Iscariot*. Judas murmured against her (John xii. 4), because she had bestowed on our Lord the offering of this precious ointment which might have been sold for 300 pence (Mark xiv. 5), and he sells his Master for thirty pieces of silver or 60 pence." But in this case Matthew would have expressly mentioned Judas instead of the disciples generally in ver. 8.—P. S.]

Of Simon the leper.—Probably Jesus had healed this Simon of his leprosy. He dwelt in Bethany. It is natural to suppose that he had made Jesus a feast in gratitude. According to a tradition in Nicephor. *Hist. Eccl.* i. 27, he was the father of Lazarus; according to others, he was the husband of Martha, or Martha his widow. All this is very uncertain; but it is not an arbitrary supposition, that he was in some way related to the family of Lazarus.

Ver. 7. **There came to Him a woman.**—"This anointing, which Mark also (ch. xiv. 3) relates, is not that recorded in Luke vii. 36 sqq.; it is so essentially distinguished from the latter in time, place, circumstances, person, as also in its whole historical and ethical connections and bearings, that we are not warranted even by the peculiarity of the event to assume different aspects of one transaction (against Chrysostom, Grotius, Schleiermacher, Strauss, Weisse, Ewald). *See* Calov. *Bibl. Illustr.* But it is not different from that which is recorded in John xii. 1 (against Origen, Chrysostom, Euth. Zigabenus, Osiander, Lightfoot, Wolf, etc.)." Meyer. Similarly de Wette; who, however, gives some supposed deviations in the two accounts. 1. According to John, the anointing took place six days before the Pass-

over; according to Matthew, two days. This has been set aside. 2. According to Matthew and Mark, the meal was in the house of Simon; according to John, in the house of Lazarus. But the expression, "they made Him a feast," is not necessarily to be referred to the family of Lazarus; certainly not to be limited to them. It is possible that all the believers in Bethany gave Him this feast; and the fact that Lazarus was among the guests to the Lord's honor, that Martha waited upon Him, and Mary anointed Him, conclude nothing against the place being Simon's house; especially as we know nothing of the near connection between the family of Lazarus and Simon. [Both families may have occupied the same house, especially if they were related, according to the ancient tradition; or, Simon may have been the owner, Lazarus the tenant, of the house.—P. S.] 3. According to Matthew and Mark, Jesus was anointed on the head; according to John, on the feet. But according to Matt. xxvi. 12, the body of Jesus generally was anointed. The connection shows why John makes prominent the anointing of the feet. 4. In the Synoptists, the disciples express their displeasure; in John, Judas Iscariot. But Matthew, ver. 14, intimates that Judas was the instigator of the murmuring, and carried the mass of the disciples with him. And for John, the glance at the traitor was the main point. According to Augustine and others, Judas might have made the remark, and the rest harmlessly consented. Meyer supposes that the original account, as given by John, had been disturbed in the Synoptists through blending it with that of Luke vii.; and that hence the name of Simon, the host, was obtained. An arbitrary assumption; since the name of Simon was very common, and the related features might have been repeated very naturally through their inner significance.

A woman.—John calls her *Mary*, the well-known, whose noble character he had drawn before in ch. xi.; *see* also Luke x. 39.

Having an alabaster-box.—More precise statement in John xii. 3. Anointing with oil was a primitive custom of consecration, Gen. xxviii. 18. It was then used for the ritual consecration of priests, Lev. viii. 12; of kings, 1 Sam. x. 1; ch. xvi. 13; occasionally also of prophets, 1 Kings xix. 16. By anointing was the Old Testament David marked out as the *Mashiach*, as also his sons; and especially the ideal David, the Saviour, Ps. ii. 2. But the anointing was interpreted of the fulness of the Spirit, Isa. xi. 2; lxi.; Heb. i. 9, after Ps. xlv. 7, 8. The anointing of the head was also a distinction which was conferred upon the guest of honor, Luke vii. 46,—not only among the Jews, but generally in the East and among the ancients: Plato, *De Republ.* iii. *See* Grotius *in Matt.* p. 501. In connection with the anointing of the head, was the washing of the feet with water. Thus it was an elevation of the custom to the highest point of honor, when the head and the feet were alike anointed with oil. Thus the anointing of the feet in Luke vii. was not simply dictated by the woman's prostration and humility: Jesus was on His journey, and the anointing of the feet was therefore primarily mentioned. And in John's account also, the fact that Jesus came as a traveller to Bethany will account for his giving special prominence to the anointing of the feet. But Matthew leaves this circumstance unnoticed. De Wette: "A whole pound of ointment (she had so much, according to John), poured out at once upon the head, would have been improper; probably it was easier for Mary to approach His feet than His head." Friedlieb supposes that the *litra* (pound) here mentioned, was the ancient and genuine litra of the Sicilian-Greek system, about $\frac{7}{10}$ of a Cologne pound. We learn from Mark, ver. 3, that she broke the alabaster-flask at the top, in order to pour out the ointment. "The ointment of nard was highly esteemed in antiquity as a precious aromatic, and a costly luxury, Plinius, xii. 26. It was brought chiefly from Asia Minor in little alabaster-flasks; and the best were to be had in Tarsus. Yet the plant grew in Southern India." *See* Winer, sub *Narde*. The best was very high in price.

Ver. 8. **They became indignant.**—According to John, Judas expressed this displeasure; according to Mark, *some* of them were indignant within themselves; according to Matthew, the body of the disciples. Matthew is wont to generalize; but his words here mean only, that the disciples collectively were led astray by the hypocritical word of Judas; symptoms of murmuring appeared in many.

To what purpose is this waste?—Ἀπώλεια, *wasting*. The active meaning must be held fast. It marks the supposed useless squandering of a costly possession. Meyer, however, takes the sense passively: *loss*.

Ver. 9. **Sold for much.**—Pliny says that a pound of this ointment cost more than four hundred *denarii*. [A *denáry*, or "penny" in the English Version, is about 15 American cents. *See* note, p. 352.] Mark mentions that three hundred was the amount specified by the murmuring disciples: about equal to 65⅔ Prussian dollars [about $45].

And given to the poor.—The money realized from the sale of the ointment. John gives the explanation, that Judas had the bag (as manager of the common exchequer), and was a thief in the management of it. The money, he takes for granted, should have gone into his bag. Under the present circumstances, with a mind darkened by desperation as to the cause of Christ, which he had begun now to renounce, he might perhaps have "deserted with the bag."

Ver. 10. **But when Jesus saw it.**—That is, the secret ungracious murmuring; for none durst speak aloud save Judas.

Why trouble ye the woman, τί κόπους παρέχετε τῇ γυναικί;—inflict not upon her any burden or disquietude by confusing her conscience, by disturbing her love, or by disparaging her noble act of sacrifice.

For she hath wrought a good work.—Literally, a *beautiful* work, marking its moral propriety and grace. Meyer: "The disciples turned away from the *moral quality* to the *expediency* of the question." Rather, they measured moral quality by practical utility, Judas doing so as a mere hypocrite. But Jesus estimated moral quality according to the principle of believing and active love from which the act sprang.

Ver. 11. **Me ye have not always.**—Not simply a "sorrowful *litotes*," to signify His speedy departure through death; but also intended to impress the unexampled significance of the occasion. Only once in the whole course of history could this particular act of reverence occur, which, humanly speaking, cheered and animated the Lord before His passion. This hour was a fleeting, heavenly opportunity which could never return; while the care of the poor would be a daily duty to humanity down to the end of time. But, at the same time, there is a general reference to the contrast between festal offerings and every-day

offerings. Only on certain special occasions may Christ be anointed; but we may always do good to the poor.

Ver. 12. **She hath poured out this ointment.**—She poured it all out, as desirous to offer the last drop. And she thereby expressed an unconscious presentiment which the Lord now interprets.

She did it for My burial [lit.: *to prepare Me for burial, to embalm Me.*]—She hath anointed and embalmed for solemn burial My body, as if it were already a corpse. The Lord gives this significance to the occasion, on account of the prophecy of his death contained in the traitor's temper: He would intimate all to Judas, and at the same time humble the disciples. The woman was not, in her act, conscious of all this inducement; but she had some presentiment which made her act as if she thought, We have come to the end; hereafter there will be no need of anointing.

Ver. 13. **This gospel.**—The tidings of salvation, with special reference to the death of Jesus.

Shall be told for a memorial of her.—Promise of a permanent justification and distinction for this eminent woman, which has been in the most glowing manner fulfilled. [Even now, while we write or read these lines, we fulfil the Saviour's prophecy. Alford well observes on this, the only case in which our Lord has made such a promise: "We cannot but be struck with the majesty of this prophetic announcement: introduced with the peculiar and weighty ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν,—conveying, by implication, the whole mystery of the εὐαγγέλιον which should go forth from His death as its source,—looking forward to the end of time, when it shall have been preached in the whole world,—and specifying the fact that this deed should be recorded wherever it is preached." He sees in this announcement a distinct prophetic recognition of the existence of *written* gospel records by means of which alone the deed related could be universally proclaimed.—P. S.]

Ver. 14. **Then one of the twelve went.**—Now did the secret of the murmuring of the disciples disclose itself, as if an old sore in the sacred circle had broken open. The woman with her ointment has hastened the healing crisis. As the hardening of the Jews was developed at the great feasts when Jesus visited them, so the hardening of Judas was completed at the feasts where Jesus was the centre.—Τότε. Meyer, unsatisfactorily, says: "After this meal; but not because he was aggrieved by Jesus' saying, which, in its tenderness of sorrow, was not calculated to wound him." The answer of the Lord approved the act of the woman, punished the complaint of Judas, sealed and confirmed the prospect of His death: all this was enough for the exasperated confusion of Judas' mind. He now began to dally with the thought of treachery (compare Schiller's *Wallenstein*), when he went over the Mount of Olives (probably the same evening) to Jerusalem, and asked a question of the enemies of Jesus which should clear up matters. But after the paschal supper the thought began to dally with him; for Satan entered into his soul (John xiii. 27). Meyer, de Wette, and Strauss, are unable to see this progress in the development of evil, and hence find here contradictions. Meyer thinks that Luke xxii. 3 more particularly is in conflict with John upon this point; though John vi. 70, compared with John xiii., has more the *semblance* of contradiction. But it must be remembered that the expression "Satan entered into him," may be used in a larger and in a more limited sense.

Ver. 15. **But they promised** [or: **secured**] **to him.**—Meyer: "*They weighed out to him*, after the old custom. There had been in the land a coined shekel since the time of Simeon (143 B. C.); but *weighing* seems to have still been customary in the temple treasury. At any rate, we are not authorized to make ἔστησαν signify simply: *they paid* ... The explanation of others, '*they made secure to him*, or *promised*' (Theophylact, Grotius, al.), is contradicted by Matt. xxvii. 3, where τὰ ἀργύρια points to the shekels as received already, as also by the prophecy of this fact in Zech. xi. 12." But Meyer overlooks the fact, that Judas, after the Passover, went again to the high priests, and that then, according to John, the matter was finally decided. They hardly gave him the money before that.

Thirty pieces of silver.—Silver shekels. The shekel, שֶׁקֶל, σίκλος, one of the Hebrew weights from early times, and one that was most in use ("like our pound"). By the weight of the silver shekel all prices were regulated in commerce and barter, down to the time of coinage in Israel after the exile. Hence the silver shekel was the current medium in all transactions of the sanctuary. The shekel of the sanctuary and the royal shekel were probably somewhat heavier than the common shekel. The half-shekel was the personal tribute to the temple, two Attic drachmas (*see* ch. xvii. 24). The value of the shekel has been estimated at about 25 *Silbergroschen** [a little over two English shillings, or 50 American cents]. Consequently 30 shekels amount to 25 [Prussian] dollars [between three and four pounds sterling, or about fifteen American dollars]. Gerlach counts 20, Lisco only 15 [Prussian] dollars. De Wette: About 42 florins.—Meyer: "Matthew alone specifies the thirty pieces of silver; and the triviality of this gain, as measured by the avarice of Judas, makes it probable that the unknown recompense of treason was fixed by evangelical tradition, according to Zech. xi. 12." Here Meyer follows de Wette, who often follows in the track of Strauss. As if Satanic avarice and treason had any reasonable tax, or as if any sum of money could more easily explain and justify the betrayal of the person of Jesus! The most improbable sum is here the most probable. Thirty pieces of silver were, according to Exod. xxi. 32, the price of a slave.† Hence, in Zech. xi. 12, the price at which the Shepherd of nations is valued, was thirty pieces of silver. The literal fulfilment of this word should not make the round sum suspicious. We should rather assume that the Sanhedrin designedly, and with cunning irony, chose the price of the slave in Exod. xxi. If Judas demanded more from them, they would answer that they needed not his help, and that at most they would give him the ancient price of a slave.

* [Not: *dollars*, as the Edinb. transl. has it, which omits the other estimate; for it takes thirty *Silbergroschen* to equal one Prussian dollar.—P. S.]

† [Joseph was sold by his brothers for twenty pieces of silver, Gen. xxxvii. 28. Jerome *on Matt.* xxvi. 15 says: "*Joseph non, ut multi putant, juxta Septuaginta interpretes, viginti aureis venditus est, sed juxta Hebraicam veritatem viginti argenteis; neque enim pretiosior poterat esse servus, quam Dominus.*" But Jerome did not see, nor any of the fathers, that thirty pieces of silver was the regular price for the life of a slave, which explains this sum in our case as a deliberate insult of the Sanhedrin to our Lord who died the death of a slave and a malefactor, that He might redeem us from the slavery and eternal misery of sin. Origen compares the 30 pieces of silver with the 30 (rather 33) years of the Saviour's life. Augustine allegorizes in another way about the number.—P. S.]

Ver. 16. **And from that time he sought opportunity.**—This does not exclude a later and final decision. He was now the wretched and vascillating watcher of events, making his last act dependent on casual opportunity. Fritzsche: *Ut eum tradere* POSSET.

To betray him.—*Genéral Remarks on the Betrayal of Judas.*—For the dualistic exaggeration of the moral importance of the man, *see* Daub: *Judas Ischarioth.* For the under-valuation of his significance, *see* Paulus, Goldhorn, Winer, Theile, Hase, etc. According to the latter view, it was his design to excite an insurrection of the people at the feast, and to constrain the tardy Messiah to base His kingdom upon popular power. In that case, the conduct of Judas would, judged by its motive, be rather that of a blinded enthusiast than of a supremely wicked man. Ewald rightly assumes that he had been mistaken in his Master; but the aims and motives which he further attributes to Judas as a consequence (that he felt it his duty to deliver Him to the Sanhedrin,—and that he wished to try the experiment and see what would follow next), are not very consistent with each other. The repentance of Judas and his suicide must be taken in connection with his betrayal; and then his state of mind will be determined to have been an ambition, excited by Satan, which sought its ends in the carnal kingdom to be set up by the Messiah, and which, therefore, when Christ's determination and that of His enemies concurred to point to His death, was changed into a deep despondency and exasperation against his Master. In this frame of mind, the scene at Bethany presented to him only a wasteful company, in which all things were going to dissolution; and he felt himself personally aggrieved by the Lord's rebuke, marking him out as an alien to His circle of disciples. Then he viewed the rulers of the people as invested with power: they had the government of the temple, and guarded its treasure—they had this world with them. It seemed to him worth his trouble to see what was to be gained on their side; thus there was the evening journey, an audience, a question—only at first, he might think, a question. In the high priest's palace, the favor of the great perfectly intoxicated him; so that even the thirty pieces of silver, which the avarice of the priests offered to his avarice, was a tempting bait. At this point he may have thought that Jesus would in the hour of need save Himself by a miracle, and go through the midst of his enemies, as He had done more than once before (Luke iv. 30; John x. 39); or that he would resort to a political kingdom in the sense of the tempter, Matt. iv. 9. On the other hand, he may have flattered himself with the prospect of the greatest favors and gains from the Sanhedrin. Under his last exasperation at the paschal supper, the thought of treason became a passionate decision. He saw himself detected and unmasked: the man of hypocrisy was then lost; the treachery was accomplished. But, when Jesus did not save Himself, and the Council no longer cared for the traitor, the thirty pieces of silver lost all their magical glitter for him. On the one hand, the scorn of the world weighed on him as a burden; and, on the other hand, the dark mystery of the death of Jesus, the possible realization of His dread predictions, and the woe of the Master still ringing in his ears. His rancorous dejection was now turned into burning despair. How he still sought to save himself, the narrative of his exit tells us. In our view of his history, such an important character among the Apostles was certainly no weak, contracted, and unawakened man. He was a man of enthusiasm, but led away by appearances; therefore, when the first manifestation of Christ paled, he lost his faith, despaired of Christ, and perished. How he could ever have entered the company of the Apostles, *see Com. on Matt.* x. The main motive of his gloomy course we may regard as a combination of covetousness and ambition carried to the verge of madness, and lost in the labyrinths of hypocrisy.*

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. In the midst of the company of disciples at Bethany, we see, represented in a living type, the contrast between Christianity and Antichristianity—an exhibition of the manner in which the one wrestles with the other, and the one is brought by the other to its ripe perfection. The lurking treachery of Judas, and the death threatening the Lord, were the dark spirit which raised the soul of the woman to a sublime, solemn, and joyous feeling of self-sacrificing love. And this noble disposition, with the anointing, the odor of which filled the whole house, became the bitterest and most decisive offence to the soul of the traitor. The fundamental characteristics of this reciprocal influence are drawn in 2 Thess. ii.

2. For the last time, Judas by his hypocrisy drew a large part of the disciples into the snare of his evil spirit. This circumstance, and the fact that he had the bag, throw some light upon his relations to the disciples generally. He was a man of fleeting enthusiasm, of deceitful appearances, of alluring promises, among the Apostles; his power of demoniacal eloquence misled most of the company, and ensnared them into sympathy. For the sake of the greater number of the Apostles, the Lord was constrained to tolerate this adversary, until he sundered himself by a spiritual judgment and an act of self-reprobation. Hence the moment of his departure was to the Lord one of the highest significance. (*See* John xiii. 31; *Leben Jesu*, ii. 3. p. 1328.)

3. The justification of festal offerings of love, in opposition to sacrifices for the proper necessities of the poor, is strictly connected with the contrast already pointed out. Judas knew nothing of Christ in the poor, when he took offence at the anointing of Christ. To his glance the world *appeared* (for the sentiment was hypocritical) to be sinking into infinite necessity and pauperism, because the ideal of worldly abundance and pleasure had demoniacally enkindled his avarice. Mary, on the contrary, poured out lavishly her store, because in her pure self-denial she let the world go, and found her peace and her blessedness in the kingdom of love and of the Spirit.

4. John looked deeper into the heart of Judas than the other disciples. Similarly, the woman went to a significant extent in advance of the disciples in the way of the New Covenant. She is a symbol of the quicker development of the female spiritual life. (Eve, the Virgin Mary.) Its perfect development and consummation, on the other hand, belongs to the man. The believing woman is here justified by the mouth of the Lord.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The house of Bethany a type of the Church:

* [Comp. Alford's estimate of the character and motives of Judas, in *Com. on Matt.* xxvi. 14-16 (p. 247, 4th ed.), which agrees with that of Neander (*Leben Jesu*, p. 688); also Ewald, Meyer, Olshausen, and Ebrard.—P. S.]

1. The Church of the Spirit darkened by the Church of hypocrisy; 2. the Church of hypocrisy condemned by the Church of the Spirit.—The self-sacrificing woman and the covetous apostle in the company of the disciples.—The self-seeking heart in the Church turns balsam into poison: 1. It turns a joyous feast into an hour of temptation; 2. the purest offering of love into an offence; 3. the sacred justification of fidelity into a motive for exasperation; 4. the most gracious warnings against destruction into a doom of death.—Even among the Lord's own company, the heart that is truly devoted to the Saviour must be prepared for the bitterest trials.—Judas the type of a fiendish spirit, which has in all times sent traitors abroad in the Church.—How he with a double mind looked always askance: 1. At the goods of this world; 2. at the favor of the great; 3. at the fellowship of the priestly order; 4. at the reward of treachery.—The little treasury of the disciples in its significant relation to the future.—Covetousness in the garment of hypocrisy.—Covetousness and ambition develop and perfect each other.—Christ and His poor.—The attempt to relieve poverty at the expense of Christ is to increase it.—The spirit of love to Christ can alone regulate the use and expenditure of earthly goods.—The pious presentiment of a loving heart thinks beyond and above its own clear consciousness. The imperishable remembrance of believers bound up with the eternal praise of the Lord.—The gospel makes all its children in two senses immortal.—"*Then went one of the twelve*" (ver. 14); or the fearful fall: 1. An image of the sinner's life; and, 2. a warning for every Christian.—"*What will ye give me?*" (ver. 15.) The commercial spirit in its light and its dark side: 1. Abraham's intercession for Sodom; his purchase of a sepulchre; the pearl of great price, etc. 2. The treachery of Judas; Simony in the Church, etc.—Christ could be sold only for the price of a slave, thirty pieces of silver: for 1. the highest price would in relation to Him be a mere mockery; 2. the lowest price for which He is surrendered up is enough for perfect treachery.—Many of His disciples are looking only for a good opportunity of betraying Him.—The beginning of the passion: Christ, like Joseph, sold by His brethren.—The apostate Christian a seducer of the enemies of Christ.—The dark mixture of sense, of calculation, and insanity in the death-path of the backslider.—The house of Bethany and the palace of the high-priest.—Christ the everlasting Defender of true Christendom against all the assaults of hypocrisy.

Starke:—God often employs weak instruments for the accomplishment of His hidden purposes, who surpass the men in Christ.—*Canstein:* He who heartily loves Christ, will gladly give up all to His service. —*Quesnel:* Riches are of no value, unless they are helpful to Christ and His people.—*Canstein:* Many perform acts out of love to Christ on which the world puts an evil construction.—He that touches one who loves Jesus, touches the apple of His eye, Zech. ii. 8. —What is given to Christ is well laid out.—An act must be estimated according to its source in the heart.—That there shall always be poor, is God's ordinance; but that there should always be beggars, might be prevented by good human ordinances.—*Quesnel:* In the actions of God's children there are often secrets which they themselves do not understand.—The memory of the just is blessed for ever, Ps. cxii. 3, 6.—Their name is as ointment poured out, Eccl. vii. 1.—Fellow-Christian, be not disquieted when your own companions, relatives, and dependants, to whom you have done nothing but good, give you an evil return; console yourself with Christ.—*Hedinger:* O cursed avarice, which still sells Christ, religion, fidelity, and faith!—How evil are often the uses of gold!—*Luther:* There is no greater enemy to man, after the devil, than a niggard, Prov. xv. 27.—He who sets out in sin will easily go on; for the opportunity to perfection is never wanting.

Gerlach:—Love to Christ urged this woman.—Her whole heart was thrown into this act.—He who loves Jesus does not love a mere man, or creature, but the true God, and eternal life.—Whoso thus inwardly loves Jesus, seeing Him present, must love Him always, when no longer seen, in His brethren, the poor.—No man among you, He says, would blame it, if so much were spent upon My burial and embalming; why do you blame *her* now, since I shall really die in a few days?

Heubner:—The last token of honor which Christ received before His death.—The sufferings of His last hour were softened to Him by these proofs of love. And so God often orders it with ourselves.—The inwardness and tenderness of which woman is susceptible in her love.—It was love to the Saviour of her soul.—It was reverential love, set upon the Son of God.—Sacrifice is the nature and nourishment of love.—In the service and love of Christ all things are dignified and made holy.—This anointing had a symbolical meaning. It was the figure of that full stream of love which poured from her heart on Jesus; the type of the inexhaustible streams of love which will proceed from the redeemed upon Jesus throughout eternity.—Application of the anointing to the missionary cause.—Jesus was manifestly moved deeply in His heart by her act. Of Himself, and the dishonor done to Him, He says nothing. It grieves Him that the woman was so badly treated. To grieve a noble soul in the performance of a glorious act, is a heavy offence.—In hurting Christlike souls, we injure Christ Himself. We should always hasten to manifest all love and sympathy toward the living. It is vain to wish them back when they are gone.—The final and highest honor done to goodness.—Christ assures her of everlasting remembrance in requital of this brief dishonor, and thereby gives her a pledge of her eternal honor in His heavenly kingdom.—What Christ determines to keep in lasting credit will be truly immortalized.—The command of John xi. 57 might have occasioned in Judas the thought which he expressed.—Pitiable are Satan's wages.

Braune:—Here a table is spread for Him in the presence of His enemies, and His head is anointed with oil, Ps. xxiii. 5.

THIRD SECTION.

CHRIST THE PASCHAL LAMB, AND THE LORD'S SUPPER.

CHAPTER XXVI. 17–30.

(Mark xiv. 12–26; Luke xxii. 7–39; John xiii. 1–xviii. 1.)

17 Now the first *day* of the *feast of* unleavened bread the disciples came to Jesus, say-
18 ing unto him, Where wilt thou that we prepare for thee to eat the passover? And he
said, Go into the city to such a man [to a certain man, πρὸς τὸν δεῖνα], and say unto him,
The Master saith, My time is at hand; I will keep the passover at thy house with my
19 disciples. And the disciples did as Jesus had appointed [directed, συνέταξεν] them;
20 and they made [and made] ready the passover. Now when the even [evening] was
21 come, he sat down [reclined at table][1] with the twelve [disciples].[2] And as they did
eat [were eating, ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν, comp. ver. 26], he said, Verily I say unto you, that one
22 of you shall [will] betray me. And they were exceeding sorrowful, and began every
23 one of them [each one][3] to say unto him, Lord, is it I? And he answered and said,
24 He that dippeth *his* [the, τήν] hand with me in the dish, the same shall [will] betray
me. The Son of man goeth [departeth, ὑπάγει] as it is written of him: but woe unto
that man by whom the Son of man is betrayed! it had been [it were] good for that
25 man if he had not been born.[4] Then Judas, which [who] betrayed him, answered and
said, Master [Rabbi, ῥαββί], is it I? He said unto him, Thou hast said [it].
26 And as they were eating, Jesus took bread,[5] and blessed[6] *it*,[7] and brake *it*, and gave
27 *it* to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. And he took the [a] cup,[8] and
28 gave thanks, and gave *it* to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; For this is my blood of
the [new][9] testament [my blood, the *blood* of the new covenant, τὸ αἷμά μου, τὸ τῆς
καινῆς διαθήκης],[10] which is shed for many for the remission [for remission, εἰς ἄφεσιν]
29 of sins. But [And] I say unto you, I will not [in no wise][11] drink henceforth of this
fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom.
30 And when they had sung a hymn [the hymn of praise, *i. e.*, the great Hallel, Ps. cxv.–cxviii.],
they went out into the mount of Olives.

[1] Ver. 20.—[Ἀνέκειτο. Dr. Lange renders ἀνάκειμαι and ἀνακλίνομαι: uniformly and correctly: *sich zu Tische lagern, to recline at table, i. e.*, according to the oriental fashion of eating, upon a couch or *triclinium*, which was usually higher than the low table itself. Hence John could lean at the last supper on Jesus' bosom, John xiii. 23. *See* Crit. Note 4 on p. 150, and the Commentators on Luke vii. 36.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 20.—Lachmann adds μαθητῶν according to A., L., M., etc. [Also Cod. Sinait.]

[3] Ver. 22.—[The *text. rec.* reads: ἕκαστος αὐτῶν. But Dr. Lange, with Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, and the majority of witnesses prefers: εἷς ἕκαστος, *each one*, without αὐτῶν.—P. S.]

[4] Ver. 24.—[Καλὸν ἦν αὐτῷ, εἰ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος. Lange: *Für ihn wäre es besser, wenn er nicht geboren wäre*, FÜR JENEN MENSCHEN; *it were better for him, if that man had not been born.* The English Versions, except Wiclif's, take the liberty of transposing the pronoun and the noun.—P. S.]

[5] Ver. 26.—The art. τόν before ἄρτον is omitted by Lachmann [and Tregelles] on the authority of B., C., D., L., etc. Meyer favors the article, [so also Tischendorf and Alford], and explains the omission from liturgical usage. [Cod. Sinait. omits the article both before ἄρτον and before ποτήριον, ver. 27. It is not found in the parallel texts: Mark xiv. 22; Luke xxii. 19.—P. S.]

[6] Ver. 26.—For εὐλογήσας: B., D., Z., and a number of later MSS., Lachmann, Tischendorf, [Alford]. For εὐχαριστήσας: Scholz with A., E., F., H., etc., consequently a larger number of witnesses. Mark has the former reading, Luke and also Paul, 1 Cor. xi. 24, the latter, and it is supposed that the liturgical expression of the Church influenced our text. [Cod. Sinait. reads εὐλογήσας, like B., D., L., Z., the Syriac, and Vulgate Versions (*benedixit*). Comp. Mark xiv. 22.—P. S.]

[7] Ver. 26.—[Dr. Lange translates: *sprach den Segen, i. e., pronounced the blessing*, or *gave thanks, blessed*, without *it*, which is omitted in the Greek, as in the following clauses and in the next verse.—P. S.]

[8] Ver. 27.—The article before *cup* is omitted by the best critical authorities. Lachmann has it according to A., D., and *Receptu.* Meyer thinks that it was inserted from liturgical language. [Cod. Sinait. and the editions of Tischendorf and Alford, omit τό. The genius both of the English and German languages, however, requires here the article, definite or indefinite, while it may be omitted in both before *bread*.—P. S.]

[9] Ver. 28.—Καινῆς is omitted by B., L., Z., etc., [Cod. Sinait.], and given up by Tischendorf and Meyer (who regard it as an insertion from the ancient liturgies); while A., D., etc., Irenæus, and Cyprian favor it, and Lachmann retains it. [So also Alford, but in brackets.] The adjective is omitted also in Mark, Codd. B., C., D. The Pauline tradition which had it, prevailed, the more so as it corresponds with the nature of the case.

[10] Ver. 28.—[Dr. Lange translates διαθήκη *Bund, covenant.* So also Castalio, Beza, Doddridge, Campbell, Norton, de Wette, Ewald (*mein Bundesblut*), Meyer, Crosby, Conant. The *new covenant* refers by contrast to the *old covenant*, that of Moses, which was consecrated by the blood of calves and goats. *See* the *Exeg. Notes.* The English Version renders διαθήκη by *testament* in thirteen passages, and by *covenant* in nineteen passages of the N. T.—P. S.]

[11] Ver. 29.—[In Greek: οὐ μή, which Dr. Lange translates more emphatically: *mit nichten, by no means, in no wise;* Meyer: *gewisslich nicht.* The Bishops' Bible translates the double negation here: *in no wise;* in ver. 35 still stronger: *by no manner of means.* Other Engl. and Germ. Vers. (also Lange in ver. 35) overlook the emphasis.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 17. **The first day of unleavened bread.**—On the 14th of Nisan the leaven was removed, and the unleavened loaves (המצות) took their place. It was the first day of unleavened bread, forming the foundation of the Passover, which did not begin till the 15th of Nisan. The feast of faith rested upon a feast of renunciation. Hence the feast was reckoned to last eight days by Josephus (*Antiq.* ii. 15, 1). These words are express against the ancient notion, that Jesus celebrated the Passover a day earlier. Comp Meyer, p. 488.

[The words τῇ δὲ πρώτῃ τῶν ἀζύμων are equivalent to the first day of the *Passover*, and important for the settlement of the chronological difficulty. All are agreed that this was Thursday, since Christ died on Friday (except Dr. Seyffarth, who makes it Wednesday, since he puts the crucifixion on Thursday). But the question is as to the day of the month, viz., whether it was the 14th of Nisan, at the close of which the paschal lamb was slain, as Dr. Lange, Wieseler, Hengstenberg, Bäumlein, Andrews, and most modern commentators of this passage assert, or the 13th of Nisan, according to the view of the Greek Church and of those commentators who, from a different point of view, try to harmonize the Synoptists with John. Had we no other guide in this matter than the Synoptists, every commentator would probably adopt the former view, for the following reasons: 1. It is the obvious meaning of the term used by all the Synoptists: "*the first day of unleavened bread*," especially if we compare Mark, who characterizes the day more fully by adding: "*When they killed the Passover* (*i. e.*, here the paschal lamb), and Luke, who says in equally clear terms: "*When the Passover must be killed.*" It was toward the close of the 14th of Nisan (probably from three o'clock till dark), that the paschal lamb was slain, and all preparations made for the feast which began with the paschal supper at evening, *i. e.*, at the close of the 14th of Nisan and the beginning of the 15th of Nisan (which day was, strictly speaking, the first day of the feast, although, in popular language, the 14th was called the first day of Passover or of unleavened bread). *See* Ex. xii. 18: "In the first month (Nisan), on the 14th day of the month at even, ye shall eat unleavened bread until the one and twentieth day of the month at even.". Comp. Lev. xxiii. 5; Num. xxviii. 16. Dr. Robinson says (*Harm.* p. 214): "Their language (of the Synoptists) is full, explicit, and decided, to the effect that our Lord's last meal with His disciples was the regular and ordinary paschal supper of the Jews, introducing the festival of unleavened bread on the evening after the 14th day of Nisan." Comp. Meyer *in loc.*: "*Es ist der 14. Nisan (nach den Synoptikern, Donnerstag) gemeint, mit dessen Abend das Passah begann, welcher aber schon ganz unter den Festtagen mitgezählt ist, nach der populär ungenauen Weise, in welcher auch Josephus, Antiq. ii.* 15, 1, ACHT *Festtage zählt.*" 2. It is very improbable that Christ, who came not to destroy but to fulfil, should have violated the legal time of the Passover, and if He did so, we would have some intimation of the fact in the Gospels. 3. An *anticipatory* sacrifice of the paschal lamb in the court of the temple, on the 13th of Nisan, a day before the legal time, would nôt have been permitted by the priests. Greswell quotes from Philo to the effect, that each man was then his own priest, and could slay the lamb in his own dwelling. But the weight of authority goes to show that the lamb must be slain in the temple and the blood be sprinkled on the altar (Deut. xvi. 5, 6; Ezra vi. 20; 2 Chron. xxxv. 11). Hence the Jews, after the destruction of the temple, have only a Memorial Passover, confined to the use of unleavened bread and bitter herbs with the usual psalms and prayers. The difficulty then arises not from the plain statements of the Synoptists, but from certain passages in John which seem to contradict the former, and from the seeming improbability that Christ should have been tried, condemned, and crucified on the 15th of Nisan, which was the most solemn day of the Passover. But it has been shown in the introduction to this chapter that these difficulties are not insurmountable, and in fact not so great as those presented on the other side. It is certain that John and the Synoptists can be harmonized on the chronological question concerning so important a part of primitive tradition as the date of the Saviour's death. —P. S.]

To prepare the Passover.—To this appertained the slaying of the paschal lamb, which usually the Jewish householder attended to, and which took place in the outer court of the temple; the preparation of the unleavened loaves; the provision of the other requisites of the feast; with the preparation of the chamber. "The τοῦ shows that this last is here intended." Probably all had been done on the present occasion by the unknown friend of the Lord, to whom ver. 18 points, without the disciples knowing anything about it beforehand. The male young lamb or goat must be one year old, and without blemish (Ex. xii. 2, 3 sqq.). It was slain "*between the evenings;*" that is, doubtless, between the decline of 14th Nisan, or the first evening, which extended to sundown, and the second evening, commencing at six o'clock. This is the chronological explanation of Josephus and the Rabbins; the more rigorous explanation of the Karaites and the Samaritans was, "between sundown and twilight." The blood of the lamb was now no longer sprinkled on the door-posts, but was taken up by a priest, and then poured or sprinkled on the altar. Starke, after Lundius (*Jüd. Alterthümer*): A crowd of Israelites was received into the court, the gates were shut, the trumpets sounded. The householders slew their lambs. The priests formed a row which extended to the altar, received the blood in silver basins, which they passed on from one to another; and those who stood nearest the altar poured it out at its feet, whence it flowed subterraneously into the brook Kedron. The householder lifted the slain lamb to a hook on a pillar, took off its skin, and removed the fat. This last the priest burned on the altar. The householder uttered a prayer, and carried the lamb to his house, bound in its skin. The head of the house where the feast was held received the skin. When the first crowd departed, another followed, and so forth.

Ver. 18. **Go into the city.**—The abode of Jesus at that time was in Bethany. According to Luke, the intimation was given to Peter and John.

To a certain man; πρὸς τὸν δεῖνα.—The Evangelist had his reasons for not mentioning the name of the man intended by Jesus. According to Calvin, Jesus did not give his name, and the disciples found it out by a miracle. According to Theophylact and others, He would not mention the name in the presence of Judas, that he might not execute his purpose of betrayal at the meal. Mark and Luke give expressly the manner in which He pointed out the man:—

at their entrance into the city a man should meet them with a pitcher of water, whom they were to follow to the house whither he went And they have the watchwords given to them which they were to speak, just as they were given to those who should fetch the two asses for the entrance into the city. Here, therefore, as there, it is to be presupposed: 1. That the man marked out was in both cases a believer; 2. that there was some kind of understanding between the Lord and the man; 3. that the understanding, especially in the present case, contemplated caution. 4. The Lord's assurance, as it regards this man, reveals the certain knowledge of the Master, and the marvellous influence of His authority. And, in the present case, this cautious action would hinder the premature accomplishment of Judas' purpose.

My time is at hand.—1. Kuinoel and others: The time of My Passover. 2. Ewald: The time of My Messianic manifestation from heaven. 3. De Wette, Meyer: The time of My death. The text gives only the meaning: the certain period of the decisive crisis. De Wette: According to the view of the Synoptists (rather, of all the Evangelists), the Passover and the passion of Christ were inseparably connected. This expression proves also the unsoundness of the old hypothesis, that Jesus ate the Passover a day earlier than the proper time.

Ver. 20. **He reclined at table.**—According to the ancient custom of reclining at the table, with the left hand resting upon the couch. It is remarkable that the Jews themselves ventured to modify the legal prescription, which required them to eat the Passover *standing*, with staff in hand, Exod. xii. 11. The rabbinical explanation is this: *Mos servorum est, ut edant stantes, at nunc comedunt recumbentes, ut dignoscatur, exiisse eos a servitute in libertatem.* [Dr. Wordsworth makes a liberal remark here, which is doubly to be appreciated as coming from a strict Episcopalian: "God had commanded the attitude of *standing* in the reception of the paschal meal; the Jewish church having come to the land of promise, and being there at rest, *reclined* at the festival, and our Lord conformed to that practice,—a proof that positive commands of a *ceremonial kind*, even of Divine origin, are not immutable if they are not in order to a *permanent* end."—P. S.]

Ver. 21. **And as they were eating.**—*The Celebration of the Passover.*—The company at table might not be less than ten persons (Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* vi. 9, 3). It generally included from ten to twenty, according to the family, or as enlarged by strangers. The image of a complete Church in the house. The rites of the feast were regulated by the succession of the cups, filled with red wine, commonly mixed with water. 1. *Announcement of the Feast.*—The head of the house uttered the thanksgiving or benediction over the wine and the feast, drinking the first cup. Then followed the remainder of the household. The washing of hands, after praise. 2. They then ate the bitter herbs, dipped in vinegar or salt water, in remembrance of the sorrows which their fathers underwent in Egypt. Meanwhile the paschal dishes were brought in—the well-seasoned broth (called *charoseth*), the unleavened loaves, the festal offerings, and the lamb. All these things were then explained. They sang the first part of the Hallel, or song of praise, Ps. cxiii., cxiv., and the second cup was drunk. 3. Then began the feast proper (at which they reclined): the householder took two loaves, broke one in two, laid it upon the whole loaf, blessed it, wrapped it with bitter herbs, dipped it, ate of it, and handed it round with the words: "This is the bread of affliction, which our fathers ate in Egypt." He then blessed the paschal lamb, and ate of it; the festal offerings were eaten with the bread, dipped in the broth; and finally the lamb. The thanksgiving for the meal followed the blessing and drinking of the third cup. 4. The remainder of the Hallel was sung, Ps. cxv.–cxviii., and the fourth cup drunk. Occasionally a fifth cup followed, while Ps. cxx.–cxxvii. were pronounced, but no more. The first cup was thus devoted to the announcement of the feast; and Luke tells us that with this cup Christ announced to the disciples that this was the last feast which He would celebrate with them in this world; and that He would celebrate with them a new feast in His Father's kingdom. The second cup was devoted to the interpretation of the festal act: with it the Apostle Paul connects the exhortation: "As oft as ye eat of this bread," etc., "ye show forth the Lord's death." The third cup followed the breaking of the loaves, which celebrated the unleavened bread, and was the cup of thanksgiving: this the Lord consecrated as the cup of the New Covenant, as He had consecrated the breaking of bread as the remembrance of His broken body, the bread of life. Thus, as in baptism He loosed from the Old Testament circumcision the sacred washing which accompanied it, and made it the New Testament sacrament of the covenant entered into, so also now He severed the breaking of bread and the cup of thanksgiving from the Old Testament Passover, and made it a sacrament of the New Testament redemption.

Two questions concerning the several modifications of the original Passover-rites, may here be briefly discussed (comp. also my *Leben Jesu*, ii. 3, p. 1422): 1. As it respects *the relation of this account to the Gospel of John:* he relates the washing of the feet, which introduced the Passover, with its interpretation; and he presupposes the institution of the Lord's Supper itself as well known. We find it hinted at in the ἐντολὴ καινή, John xiii. 34. The contention as to which was the greatest, Luke xxii. 24, probably preceded the feet-washing, and was its immediate occasion. 2. As to *the participation of Judas in the Lord's Supper*, we learn from John (xiii. 30) that the traitor went away immediately after he had received the sop dipped in the vessel of the *charoseth*. As the sop can hardly be supposed to mean only the bitter herbs, the distribution of the bread must have preceded, if the rites had gone on as usual, but not the distribution of the third cup. Thus it might seem that Judas departed between the breaking of the bread and the cup of thanksgiving. The account of Luke, indeed, and it alone, appears to pre-suppose the participation of Judas in the full supper of both bread and wine. But his chronological sequence is not exact; for it is his purpose to mark strongly the contradiction between the spirit and feelings of the disciples, and the sacred meaning of the feast. Hence the contention follows at the close, ver. 24, although it had doubtless taken place before the washing of the feet. But Luke likewise assures us that Christ blessed the cup μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι, so that the later declaration: "The hand of him that betrayeth Me is with Me on the table," must be referred to an earlier moment. After the third cup nothing more was eaten. But if we mark Matthew's account more carefully, we may conclude that the breaking of the bread was deferred a little beyond the exact ritual time. It took place after the traitor was indicated

as such, and after he had doubtless departed. Hence, then, the glorification of the Son of Man, according to John, in the symbolical act of the Supper, might proceed, John xiii. 31. Most of the Fathers and schoolmen were in favor of Judas' participation: Cyprian, Jerome, Augustine,* Thomas Aquinas, Calvin,† Beza, etc. Against it were Tatian, Ammonius, Hilary,‡ etc., and many Reformed theologians [also Nast, p. 572]. The discussion of the point cannot, without forcing, be made theologically important in the confessional controversies between Romanists and Protestants, Lutherans and Reformed. Comp. Wichelhaus, l. c., p. 257.

[Ver. 21. **One of you will betray Me.**—Wordsworth: "Observe how tenderly He deals with the traitor. Before supper He washed his feet; and He did not say: *he* will betray Me, but '*one of you*,'—in order to give him an opportunity for repentance; and He terrifies them all, in order that He may save one. And when He produced no effect on his insensibility by this indefinite intimation, yet, still desirous of touching his heart, He draws the mask off from the traitor, and endeavors to rescue him by denunciations."—Similar remarks are made by the Fathers, Chrysostom, Jerome, and Leo M. *See Catena Aurea.*—P. S.]

Ver. 22. **Lord, is it I?**—*See* the particulars of this scene in Com. on St. John.

Ver. 23. **Into the dish.**—According to John, an allusion to Ps. xli. 10. Meyer, following de Wette: "Yet no such plain intimation as that which, in John xiii. 26, Jesus gave to John. For it is not probable that the dipping took place after the expression of Jesus in ver. 21, and after the sensation of ver. 22, but rather *before*, when certainly several of the disciples had had their hand in the dish." The last is quite doubtful. Comp. my remarks on Mark xiv. 20.—Meyer: "What is meant here was the sop of *charoseth* (חרוסת), which was prepared of dates, figs, etc., and which was of a brick color (in remembrance of the Egyptian bricks; Maimonides, *ad Pesach*, 7, 11)."

Ver. 24. **The Son of Man departeth.**—That is, to death.

As it is written of Him.—De Wette: "This indicates the necessity of death or fate, after the Jewish view." It rather indicates the Father's counsel according to the knowledge of Christ.

But woe!—De Wette calls this an imprecation, as in ch. xviii. 6; confounding the Christian and the heathenish spirit, as before. The expression was a proverbial one, and very common, as Wetstein shows by many rabbinical passages. Here, it is to be remembered, the man as that particular man *in his act* is meant; not the man in himself, as that would throw an imputation upon his original creation. [Stier: This *woe* is the most affecting and melting *lamentation of love*, which feels the woe as much as holiness requires or will admit.—P. S.]

Ver. 25. **Thou hast said it.**—Formula of affirmation common among the Jews, Greeks, and Romans. De Wette and Meyer consider this passage contradictory to John xiii. 26. But it is no other than one of those cases in which John supplements the rest. Without doubt, Judas only at the last moment asked, "*Is it I?*" and the answer of Jesus, spoken probably with softened voice, retreated behind the exclamation, "*What thou doest, do quickly!*"

Ver. 26. **As they were eating, Jesus took bread.**—Not after the finished paschal feast, as Wetstein, Kuinoel, and Scholz suppose. Rather, as we have seen, the breaking of the bread, and the cup of thanksgiving, were taken from two elements in the Passover-rite. But the act of the breaking of the bread is brought down somewhat later; unless we assume that it had already taken place in a preparatory way, and thus was in some sense repeated. [The Fathers refer here to the consecration of bread and wine by Melchisedek, the priest-king, as a type of the Eucharist (Gen. xiv. 18 sqq.; Ps. cx. 4; Heb. vii. 1–15). Bengel observes on the order εὐλογήσας, ἔκλασε (comp. Luke xxii. 19 and 1 Cor. xi. 24, εὐχαριστήσας, ἔκλασε): "FREGIT *post* BENEDICTIONEM; *contra transubstantiationem. Accidens enim, quale post benedictionem panem esse ajunt, non potest frangi.*" From the giving of thanks (εὐχαριστήσας) and blessing (εὐλογήσας) the offering, the holy communion is called εὐχαριστία. *See* the patristic passages in Suicer's *Thesaurus, sub verbo.*—P. S.]

Take, eat; this is My body.—*This*, in the neuter (τοῦτο). Therefore not directly ὁ ἄρτος. So, in what follows, *this* is not the cup, but what was presented. Starke: "The expression: 'The bread is the body of Christ, the wine Christ's blood,' is not properly scriptural, but a *propositio ecclesiastica*; although it is not incorrect, rightly understood." Against the doctrine of transubstantiation.* So, in 1 Cor. xi. it is not, "This cup is My blood." Meyer (a Lutheran by profession) thus explains the words of institution: "Since the whole Passover was a symbolical festival of remembrance; since, further, the body of Jesus was still unbroken, and His blood still unshed: none of those present at the table could have supposed that they were doing what was impossible,—that is, that they were in any sense actually eating and drinking the body and blood of the Lord. Again, the words spoken, according to Luke and Paul, in connection with the cup (ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη), absolutely exclude the sense that the wine in the cup was actually itself the New Covenant. For all these reasons, ἐστί can be no other than the copula of symbolical relation. 'This broken bread here which you are to take and to eat *is* symbolically *My body*, or the symbol of My body which is about to be offered up.'" So far Meyer. He then contends against the reference of the σῶμα to the mystical body of Christ, the Church (a view held by Œcolampadius, Schulthess, and Weisse). We distinguish, in conformity with the tenor of all the ritual usages of the Old Covenant, between the *allegorical*, the *symbolical*, and the *typical* meaning, as they all concur in the *sacramental*. 1. The *allegorical* (commonly called *symbolical*):

* [Augustine: "Peter and Judas received of the same bread, but Peter to life, Judas to death."—P. S.]

† [Calvin is not positive on this point. Compare his remarks on Luke xxii. 21 (in Tholuck's edition of Calvin's *Com. on the Harmony of the Gospels*, i. p. 307): "*Ideo apud Lucam ponitur adversaria particula, veruntamen ecce manus prodentis me mecum est in mensa. Etsi autem peracta demum cœna hoc Christi dictum Lucas subjicit,* NON POTEST *tamen inde certa colligi temporis series, quam scimus* SÆPE *ab Evangelistis* NEGLIGI. PROBABILE TAMEN ESSE NON NEGO, JUDAM AFFUISSE, *quum corporis et sanguinis sui symbola Christus suis distribueret.*"—P. S.]

‡ [Hilary: "The passover was concluded . . . without Judas, for he was unworthy of the communion of eternal sacraments."—P. S.]

* [Similarly Alford: "The form of expression is important, not being οὗτος ὁ ἄρτος, or οὗτος ὁ οἶνος, but τοῦτο, in both cases, or τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον, not the bread or wine itself, but the *thing* itself in each case; *precluding the idea of a substantial change.*"—P. S.]

The paschal lamb was an appropriate *didactic* figure of the ideally sacrificed first-born and their deliverance, a figure which at the same time signified the deliverance of Israel:—the breaking of the bread and the cup signify the broken body and the shed blood of Christ. 2. The *symbolical:* The paschal lamb was the symbol and *assuring* sign or pledge of the propitiatory offering up of the spiritual first-born, the priests of Israel set apart for the people:—the bread and the cup are the sealing signs of the redeeming propitiation which was accomplished by Christ in His perfect high-priestly sacrifice, which was changed from a sin-offering of death into a thank-offering of life. 3. The *typical:* The feast of the Passover was a prophecy in act; that is, the *medium* and the *sign* of the future of the suffering and triumphing Christ:—the bread and the cup are the type; they are the media of the spiritual transformation of believers through fellowship with the glorified Christ. Thus, didactic spiritual enlightenment, a sealed covenant redemption, and real participation in the glorified Christ, are the three elements which make the Supper a mysterious seal or sacrament of finished salvation. According to Meyer, the Lutherans and the Roman Catholics agree in the *exegetical* interpretation of ἐστί, since both take the word as the copula of actual being. He thinks they only differ in their *dogmatic* definition of the manner of the being. Similarly there is an exegetical agreement and a dogmatic disagreement between Zwingli and Calvin, who both take the ἐστί as a symbolical copula. But doctrine goes back to exegesis. The ἐστί of the Romanists means in fact: "*it has become* in a hidden manner;" that of the Lutherans: "*it is in a certain sense* and *partially;*" that of Zwingli: "it is in an exclusively *spiritual* sense;" that of Calvin: "it is in a concrete, *spiritual-real* manner." On the allegorical and symbolical occurrence of ἐστί (which, however, was not spoken in Aramaic), *see* Exod. xii. 11; John xv. 1; Luke vii. 1; Gal. iv. 24; Heb. x. 20.

[De Wette, Meyer, Alford, and others agree with Lange that the verb *is* was not spoken in the original Aramaic (הָא גּוּשְׁמִי or בִּשְׂרִי). Alford, whose lengthy explanation of the words of institution does not seem to me very clear, infers from this probable omission that the much controverted ἐστί should not be urged at all. "In the original tongue in which the Lord spoke, *it would not be expressed;* and as it now stands, it is merely the *logical copula* between the subject *this* and the predicate *My body.*" But the verb is in the Greek text, and has to be disposed of in some way. De Wette thinks that ἐστί may be real (Luther), or symbolical = *significat* (Zwingli); but that here the latter alone is admissible in view of the symbolical character of the whole discourse and action, and in view of the impossibility of Christ's real living body being *then* offered to the disciples as food. He refers to Luke xii. 1; Heb. x. 20; Gal. iv. 24; John xiv. 6; xv. 1, 5, etc., as instances of this symbolical meaning of ἐστί. A very large number of other passages have been quoted over and over again in the various stages of the sacramental controversy, by Ratramnus, Berengarius, Zwingli, Schulz, and others, in favor of the figurative interpretation. It is an acknowledged law of thought and language that the copula never really identifies two things essentially different, but brings simply the subject and predicate into a relation, the exact nature of which depends upon the nature of the subject and predicate. This relation may be real or symbolical, may be full or partial identity, or mere resemblance. But it is perhaps more correct to say, that the figure in these cases does not lie, as is usually assumed, in the auxiliary verb (ἐστί), but, as Œcolampadius suggested, and as Maldonatus maintains in his lengthy exposition of Matt. xxvi. 26 (though he denies the figure in this case), either in the subject, or more usually in the predicate. If I say of a picture: "This is Martin Luther," I mean to say: This is (really and truly) a picture of Martin Luther, or the man which this picture represents is M. L. If I say: "The dove is the Holy Spirit," I mean to identify the dove with the Holy Spirit only in a symbolical or figurative sense. In both these cases the figure lies in the subject. But if I say: "Peter, thou art rock," or "Christ is the rock, the lamb, the door, the bread, the vine," etc., etc., the figure lies in the predicate, and I mean to convey the idea that Christ is really all this, not in a literal and physical, but in a higher spiritual sense, the rock of ages, the lamb of God, the bread of eternal life. As to the words of institution, already Tertullian explained them by circumscribing: *hoc est figura corporis mei*, but he also uses the term *repræsentat* for *est* (*Adv. Marc.* i. 14; iii. 19; iv. 40). That there is *something* figurative in the words of the Saviour, is conclusively evident from the text according to St. Luke and St. Paul: τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον (not: οὗτος ὁ οἶνος) ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι, where the cup is used for the wine,—a clear case of a *synecdoche continentis pro contento*,—and the covenant for the blood. Maldonatus, the Jesuit commentator, to get rid of this difficulty, boldly declares that Christ never spoke these words ("*Nego Christum hæc verba dixisse*," etc.); but this does not help the case, since the inspired Luke and Paul must certainly be regarded as authentic expounders of the Saviour's meaning, and Paul moreover expressly declares that he derived his account of the institution of the holy supper directly from the Lord. We see then that even the Romish interpretation, which otherwise is the most consistently literal, cannot be carried out exegetically, much less philosophically, and in order to maintain the thesis, that the bread is no bread at all as to substance, but the real body of Christ and nothing else, it must contradict the laws of reason, the testimony of the senses (the eyes, the smell, the taste), the declaration of Paul, who calls the eucharistic bread still bread, even after the consecration (1 Cor. x. 16; xi. 26, 27, 28), and must overthrow the true nature of the sacrament by destroying the natural elements. But the figurative exposition of the words of institution does by no means force us to stop with that sober, jejune, common-sense view of the Lord's Supper, which regards it as a *purely* commemorative ordinance; it is perfectly consistent with the deeper view that it is at the same time the feast of a vital union of the soul with the whole person of the Saviour, and a renewed application of all the benefits of His atoning sacrifice, so significantly exhibited and offered in this holy ordinance. *See* the further *Exeg. Notes*, and the *Doctrinal Thoughts* below.—P. S.]

Eat.—Meyer: Eating and drinking are the symbol of the spiritual appropriation of the saving virtue of the sacrifice of Christ in His crucifixion and blood-shedding (comp. Paul: τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν), in living and saving faith (comp. John vi. 51 sqq.); so that this symbolical participation of the elements represents a spiritual, living, and vivifying κοινωνία with the body and blood (1 Cor. x. 16). De Wette (after Olshausen): "We must not suppose that Jesus Himself ate

of this bread; He imparted simply, but did not receive." This is contrary to the profound meaning of communion (symbolized by the shew-bread), which is also communion with the Lord. Just because the dying Saviour Himself partook of the bread and wine, He imparted to these elements their unique significance. It is true, however, that at the words and during the act of distribution the disciples alone received the bread and the wine. Starke: "Some of the Fathers (Jerome, Augustine) held the opinion that Jesus ate and drank; hence they said that He was *sui ipsius hospes*. But, if we yield this at all, we must qualify it by saying that it was not a *comestio sacramentalis*, but a *prægustatio* and *præhibitio consecratoria*." De Wette: "With σῶμα there is wanting the necessary τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον of Luke, or the κλώμενον of Paul (which, perhaps, is still better supported), in order that not a substance, but a fact, might be indicated." We say rather a substance in action. The words of Luke: "*Do this in remembrance of Me*," were derived from the nature of the institution, and remained in the remembrance of the Church; among the Jewish Christians, for whom Matthew wrote, the words might have been omitted the more easily, because they still celebrated the Passover.

Ver. 27. **And He took the cup.**—The article is doubtful. But it is defined, not only by Luke and Paul, but also by Matthew, as the well-known cup in connection with or after the meal, which could only be the third,—as is proved also by the mention of the communion cup as the cup of thanksgiving in 1 Cor. x. 16, which corresponds with the name of the third cup in the Jewish Passover. Meyer, on the contrary, asks: "Where would then have been the fourth cup, over which the second part of the Hallel was sung?" And he thinks it improbable that Jesus, after the cup of symbolical significance, would have added another cup without any such significance, also that ver. 29 excludes any additional cup. But the fourth cup marked the conclusion of the whole feast, and as such needed no particular mention. Moreover, it had no special reference to the paschal lamb, as Maimonides testifies (Lightfoot): *Deinde miscet poculum quartum, et super illud perficit Hallel, additque insuper benedictionem Cantici, quod est: "Laudent te, domine, omnia opera tua," etc., et dicit: "Benedictus sit, qui creavit fructum vitis,"—et postea non quidquam gustat illa nocte.*

[**Drink all ye of it.**—The πάντες, which stands in connection with the drinking of the cup, but not with the eating of the bread, supplies a strong argument against the withdrawal of the cup from the laity; for the disciples represent here the *many*, ver. 28, or the whole church of the redeemed, and not the ministry alone. The same may be said of the words of the Saviour: ὁσάκις ἐὰν πίνητε, according to the report of St Paul. BENGEL: "*Si una species sufficeret, bibendum esset potius. Etiam* 1 *Cor. xv.* 25 τό QUOTIES *in poculi mentione ponitur. Locuta sic est Scriptura*, PRÆVIDENS (*Gal. iii.* 8) *quid Roma esset factura.*" Still stronger, CALVIN: "*Cur de pane simpliciter dixit ut ederent, de calice, ut* OMNES *biberent? Ac si Satanæ calliditati ex destinato occurrere voluisset.*" Maldonatus, who dwells with undue length on this section to prove the Romish dogma of transubstantiation, notices the objection of Calvin, but disposes of it in a lame and sophistical manner.—P. S.]

Ver. 28. **This is My blood.**—That is, the wine. Meyer: "The symbol does not lie, as Wetstein and others think, in the (red) color, but in the being poured out." But also, we add, in the nature of wine, the noble blood of the grape (*see* John xv. 1; Gen. xlix. 11, 12).—The **blood** of the covenant. Body and blood are something like counterpart terms, but they are not precisely parallels: else we would read: "This is My flesh;—this is My blood" (John vi. 53). It is usual to pay regard to the parallel terms as such; but to forget the *sequence* of the two expressions. The body signifies the whole, as the broken and dying outer life; the blood then signifies the whole as the inner life (the principle of the soul) poured out in sacrifice to God, by Him given back to the Redeemer for the world. The idea that the blood was to be drunk, is intelligible only when it is regarded as the new life received by God and given back to the offerers, that is, as the wine of the New Covenant. The Jews were not allowed to eat the flesh of a burnt-offering: the priests alone ate of the sin-offering; the laity of the thank-offerings. But the sacrificial blood, which belonged to God, it was permitted to none to drink. So far was this carried, that the eating of blood in any form was absolutely forbidden. And now Christ gives to His people His blood to drink. That cannot mean as the blood yet to be offered to God; but as the blood of the new risen life, which, having been poured out for many for the forgiveness of sins, was accepted of God and given back to the New Covenant High Priest and to His Church. In the distribution of the body, the act of death is ideally presupposed, as the fulfilled and perfected expiation; and so, in the distribution of the blood, the act of reconciliation. But the consummate and sealed reconciliation is connected rather with the resurrection of Christ and its influence. And this is the predominant element in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Baptism represents fellowship with the whole Christ, fellowship with both His death and His resurrection; yet with special emphasis upon the death. The Lord's Supper, again, signifies fellowship with the whole Christ; yet with special emphasis upon the resurrection. *Hence the cup is the chief thing in the Eucharist;* and a communion in bread alone (as in the Roman Church) bears too much resemblance to a new baptism.

The blood of the (new) covenant.—דַּם הַבְּרִית, Exod. xxiv. 8. Meyer: "My blood, serving for the establishment of a covenant with God." Rather, "My blood which ratifies and seals the covenant already established." For the covenant is in Exod. xxiv. supposed to have been entered into when the lamb was slain; and hence the offering of burnt-offerings and thank-offerings. The blood of the thank-offering is now in part poured out upon the altar, and in part sprinkled upon the people. Here first enters in the idea of a sacrificial blood which Jehovah gives back to the offering people—the essential germ of the sacramental participation of the blood in the Lord's Supper. This blood serves also unto purification, according to Heb. ix. 14. But this purification is no longer the negative expiation, which abolishes the sin of the old life; it is the sanctification which completes positively the new life. The ordinary symbol of purification was water, though not without the addition of blood (Lev. xiv. 6). The higher purification was the sprinkling with blood (the idea of the baptism of blood was the consummation of life in the ancient Church). This cleansing is not merely the removal of the impure, but also the positive communication of a new life, which cannot be lost. Hence, in the Old Testament, the sprinkling of blood was followed by eating and drinking on

the part of Moses and the priests and the elders upon the Mount of God: Exod. xxiv. 11,—a very manifest type of the New Testament.

Which is shed (or: **being shed**) **for many** (τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυνόμενον). — Present tense. [Compare the addition to σῶμα in Luke: τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον, *which is being given.*] The sacrifice is already virtually accomplished, and the future act realized in the Lord's first Supper. Hence, this eternal ideal presence of the atoning death is continued throughout all ages in the sacrament, because the offering was presented in the Eternal Spirit; but the Romish repetition of the sacrifice reduces the great atonement to a mere act of the past, a temporary event, however significant in its bearings and effects. Matthew writes περί, Luke ὑπέρ. While these prepositions are often interchanged, ὑπέρ is the more definite expression. Matthew, however, adds the explanation, εἰς ἄφεσιν; and therefore, in accordance with biblical typology, only an expiatory offering can be meant, yet at the same time an expiatory offering which is transformed by the grace of the reconciled God into a thank-offering. For the blood of the sin-offering as such belonged to God alone. The objective sprinkling of the blood, and the subjective act of faith, are both supposed.

Ver. 29. **I will not drink henceforth.**—Meyer refers this to the fourth cup as the eucharistic cup;* but it seems rather to intimate that this fourth cup was drunk, as usual, in addition (after the eucharistic ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας), at the close of the feast, as the thanksgiving for the blessing of the wine. Hence the expression, "*fruit of the vine.*" At the same time, Christ marks this moment as His perfected renunciation of all things: His enjoyment of all things in this world had come to its end. It was the last cup of this world. Hence He consecrates this sad moment as the anticipatory festival of a common enjoyment in the world of glory. Bengel: *Novitatem dicit plane singularem.* Kuinoel: The expression is figurative, signifying the highest happiness. The new wine of the glorified world, or of the kingdom of heaven, is a symbol of the future festal blessedness of the heavenly world, even as that earthly cup (especially the fourth one) was a symbol of the festal enjoyment of the spiritual life in this divinely created world.

[This verse implies that the Lord's Supper has not only a commemorative and retrospective, but also a prophetic and prospective meaning. It not only carries us back to the time of the crucifixion, strengthening our vital union with the Redeemer, and conveying to us anew, by the power of the Holy Spirit, through faith, all the blessings of His atoning sacrifice; but it is also a foretaste and anticipation of the great Marriage Supper of the Lamb which He has prepared for his Church at His last advent, when all eucharistic controversies will cease forever, and give place to perfect vision and fruition in harmony and peace.—P. S.]

Ver. 30. **And when they had sung the hymn of praise,** ὑμνήσαντες.—The second part of the Hallel, Ps. cxv.–cxviii.

To the Mount of Olives: that is, to Gethsemane, ver. 36. Meyer: The tradition, that people were obliged to spend this night in Jerusalem (Lightfoot), seems not to have had a universal application. But ancient Jerusalem extended as far as the eastern declivity of the mount. And it is at least remarkable, in relation to this tradition, that Jesus did not go to Bethany.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The relations between the typical and the real salvation by judgment, between the typical and the real redemption, the typical and the real Passover, the typical and real covenant institution, the typical and real feast of the covenant (Exod. xxiv. 3-11). On the significance of the Passover, compare also the typological writings of Bähr, Kurtz, Sartorius, [Fairbairn], etc.

2. *The Woe Pronounced on Judas.*—It were better for him that he had never been born. This is held, and rightly so, to prove the perdition of the traitor. But when his *endless* perdition is established by this text, and the words are taken literally, orthodoxy must take care lest the consequence be deduced, that it would have been better for *all* the condemned generally never to have been born, and evil inferences be drawn as to their creation. But our Lord's expression cuts off such abstract discussions; it says only that it were better that he, ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος, had never been born. This may be said of every sinner generally, inasmuch as his sin is the beginning of eternal death; but it held good especially, and in an immeasurably heightened sense, in the case of the traitor. We should feel and realize the full force of this most fearful word; yet without overstraining it, remembering that it is no *final judicial sentence*, but a burning expression rather of infinite pity.

3. That the first holy communion was at the same time an institution of the ordinance for His perpetual commemoration, is manifest from the express declaration of the Lord in Luke, from the account given by all the Evangelists, and from the testimony of the Church.

4. And it appears, further, from the particulars of the first supper, that it could not have been celebrated according to the Catholic, the Lutheran, or the Reformed doctrine; but that it was celebrated rather as an *annunciation* of the saving death of Jesus. It was the reconciliation of the disciples with the death of reconciliation; and, as Dietlein says (1857), a confession in the form of action, and not of doctrinal teaching. The development of the doctrine of the sacrament, however, became an ecclesiastical necessity, although by no means the confusion of Christian disputants about the doctrine. On the dogmatic question we must refer to the doctrinal histories generally, and to the monographs of Ebrard on the Reformed side (1845), of Kahnis on the Lutheran (1851), and also of Dieckhoff (1854).*

Meyer, p. 443,† sums up the views of Ebrard and Kahnis with the remark: "It would be easy on the

* [The Edinb. trsl. reads: "Meyer thinks this *excludes* the fourth cup;" and thus attributes to him the very opposite opinion. Comp. note on ver. 27, and Meyer's *Com. on Matt.* p. 500 (4th ed.): "ὅτι οὐ μὴ πίω, DASS ICH GEWISSLICH NICHT TRINKEN WERDE. *Diess setzt . . . voraus, dass es der* LETZTE [the fourth], *nicht der vorletzte* [the third] *Becher des Mahles war, welchen er V. 27 f. gegeben hatte. . . . Es war der* SCHLUSSbecher, *bei dessen Genuss der zweite Theil des Hallel gesungen wurde*"—P. S.]

* [Comp. also the able work of Dr. I. W. NEVIN: *The Mystical Presence*, Philadelphia, 1846 (a defence of the Calvinistic theory with some modification), together with Dr. CH. HODGE's review of it in the *Princeton Review* for 1848 (from the Zwinglian stand-point), and Dr. NEVIN's defence in the *Mercersburg Review* for 1849.—P. S.]

† [In the third edition of his Commentary, to which Dr. Lange always refers. In the fourth edition of 1858 it is p. 499.—P. S.]

way which is supposed to lead to the Lutheran theory, to arrive at the dogma of transubstantiation, because both theories rest on doctrinal premises to which the exegetical treatment is made to conform." The different interpretations of the various evangelical confessions are not *necessarily* contradictory and exclusive, but may, with certain modifications, be reconciled under a higher theory. Comp. my *Positive Dogmatik*, p. 1144. The Reformed divines will always insist on the allegorical and symbolical interpretation of the words of institution as a proper starting point (comp. Martensen, § 262); while the Lutherans, on the other hand, will maintain that the holy communion is not only the sign and seal of the negative abolition of the guilt of sin by the death of Christ, but also a positive celebration and communication of the new life of Christ, as also the symbolical anticipation and typical foundation of the final glorification of the spiritual life of believers.*

[Dr. Lange refers here, without naming it, to MARTENSEN'S *Christliche Dogmatik* (German translation from the Danish, 2d ed. Kiel, 1853, § 262, p. 491), where this distinguished Lutheran divine of Denmark concedes the relative truth of *Zwingli's* symbolical interpretation, but combines with it the *Lutheran*, at least as to its substance, concerning the actual fruition of Christ. As this interesting work is not accessible to the English reader, as far as I know, I will translate the passage in full: "The Romish doctrine of transubstantiation resolves the natural elements into an empty show, and violates the order of nature in order to glorify the order of grace. Against this the *whole* Evangelical Church protests, and maintains the natural identity of the sensual signs. 'Bread is bread, and wine is wine,' both are *symbols* only (nur *Sinnbild*) of the body and blood of Christ. In this sense, as a rejection of transubstantiation, the entire Evangelical Church owns and adopts Zwingli's interpretation: '*this signifies*' (*dies bedeutet*). And in this church-historical connection Zwingli's sober common-sense view acquires a greater importance than Lutheran divines are generally disposed to accord to it. Zwingli himself almost stopped with this negative protest; while Luther held fast to the real presence of the Lord (comp. *Conf. Aug.* art. x.), but a presence which is veiled and hid under the natural signs, and communicates the heavenly gifts of grace *in*, *with*, and *under* the same. Calvin sought out a medium path between Zwingli and Luther, but his theory of the real presence represents a one-sidedness the very opposite to that of the doctrine of transubstantiation [?], by separating dualistically what Romanism mixes and confounds."—P. S.]

[In this connection it may be proper to refer to a recent controversy, as far as it bears on the exegetical aspect of the eucharistic question, among Lutheran divines. Dr. C. FR. AUG. KAHNIS, who is quoted above by Meyer and Lange as the chief modern champion of the Lutheran doctrine of the eucharist,† as EBRARD is of the Calvinistic,‡ has recently changed his view on the exposition of the words of institution, and thus superseded the lengthy note of Meyer (*Com. on Matthew*, p. 498 sq. 4th ed.) above quoted in part by Dr. Lange. In his recent work on didactic theology,* he gives up the *literal* interpretation of the ἐστί, to which Luther always resorted as the strongest bulwark for his theory of the real corporeal presence of Christ in the sacramental elements (*in*, *cum et sub pane et vino*). I will translate the exegetical results (without the arguments) at which Kahnis arrives in the first volume of his *Dogmatics*: "Where such difficulties are to be overcome, it is well to proceed from principles which command assent. 1. It is beyond a doubt that the sentence: 'The bread is the body, the wine is the blood of Jesus,' taken literally, is logically an impossibility.... Bread and body are heterogeneous conceptions which can no more be identified as subject and predicate than: Hegel is Napoleon, or, this wood is iron.... 2. It is beyond controversy that the sentence: 'This is my body,' may be figurative (metaphorical). The Scriptures contain innumerable figurative sentences.... 3. The words of institution say plainly that the body of Christ is here spoken of as the one which was to be offered up in death.... If bread and wine are the subject, then the literal interpretation must be given up, and to this we are forced even by the sentence: 'This *cup* is the new covenant in my blood,' which ... *must* mean: This cup is a sign of the new covenant...." Dr. Kahnis then goes on to prove that the Lord's Supper is not a *mere* memorial, but also a feast of the life union of believers with the whole Christ, etc., but adds expressly, that Christ can only be received in a *spiritual* manner (not by oral munducation), *i. e.*, by faith. In his self-defence against Dr. Hengstenberg (*Zeugniss von den Grundwahrheiten des Protestantismus*, etc., Leipzig, 1862, p. 26 sqq.) he discusses the question again, and arrives at the conclusion (p. 28) that "the Lutheran interpretation of the *words of institution* must be given up," but that this matter affects only the Lutheran *theology*, not the Lutheran *faith*, which he thinks is substantially right, though resting on an untenable exegetical basis. He also expresses his conviction (p. 29) that there is a possibility of a higher union and reconciliation of the Lutheran and Reformed doctrine on the eucharist. Dr. Francis Delitzsch, of Erlangen, another prominent divine and Biblical scholar of the strict *Lutheran* type, in his pamphlet: *Für und wider Kahnis*, Leipzig, 1863, p. 28, thus speaks of his friend's recent change on this particular point: "In the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, Kahnis has no intention of giving up the Lutheran dogma, he only thinks it necessary to drop the Lutheran exposition of the words of institution. He admits, indeed, that in themselves considered, they may be understood *synecdochically*, as it may be said of the dove which descended at the baptism of John: 'This dove is the Holy Spirit;' but he regards this synecdochical relation inapplicable in this case on account of the words of Luke and Paul: *τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη*. We think, on the contrary, that these words confirm the Lutheran exegesis; for they present evidently a *synecdoche continentis pro contento*: the cup is the New Testament in Jesus' blood, because it contains and exhibits this very blood of the Testament which is the ground, bond, and seal of the New Covenant. As Kahnis does not mean to discredit, but rather to save the Lutheran dogma, we may hope that he may find out at last that the words of institution which have become un-

* [The Edinb. trsl. omits the greater part of the original, sub No. 4.—P. S.]

† [See his *Lehre vom Abendmahle*, Leipzig, 1851, p. 472.—P. S.]

‡ [In an elaborate *History of the Dogma of the Lord's Supper*, in 2 vols., Frankf. 1845–'46, also in his *Dogmatics*, and in a review of Dr. NEVIN'S *Mystical Presence* in ULLMANN'S *Studien und Kritiken*, but I do not remember for which year, probably 1850.—P. S.]

* [*Lutherische Dogmatik* vol. i. Leipzig, 1861, p. 616 sqq.—P. S.]

certain and unsettled to his mind, still stand fast, and that his new doctrine of the Lord's Supper is only a shadow, not the substance, of the Lutheran dogma." Dr. Ebrard, on the other hand, a distinguished champion of the *Reformed* Confession, in the second edition of his *Christliche Dogmatik*, Königsberg, 1863, vol. ii. p. 638, expresses his satisfaction that Kahnis has come over, as he thinks, to his own view on the Lord's Supper, which he formerly opposed, but censures him rather severely for not giving him credit for indebtedness to his (Ebrard's) argument. Dr. Kahnis will take care of his originality. But we firmly believe that the Lutheran and Reformed views can be essentially reconciled, if subordinate differences and scholastic subtleties are yielded, and that the chief elements of reconciliation are already at hand in the Melanchthonian-Calvinistic theory. The Lord's Supper is: 1. A commemorative ordinance, a memorial of Christ's atoning death. (This is the truth of the Zwinglian view which no one can deny in the face of the words of the Saviour: *Do this in remembrance of Me*). 2. A feast of living union of believers with the Saviour, whereby we truly, though spiritually, receive Christ with all His benefits and are nourished by His life unto life eternal. (This was the substance for which Luther contended against Zwingli, and which Calvin retained, though in a different scientific form, and in a sense confined to believers.) 3. A communion of believers with one another as members of the same mystical body of Christ. *See* below, No. 9.—P. S.]

5. The Lord's Supper is not a *sacrifice*, but a festal *thank-offering*. Hence the name *Eucharist*, which connects itself with the *cup of thanksgiving*. Gregory the Great was the first who changed the idea of the New Testament thank-offering into that of a sin-offering; and those evangelical theologians who are anxious to establish in the Supper a continued propitiation, have already passed the Rubicon between the Evangelical Confession and Romanism.

6. Meat and drink; bread and wine: type of the whole nourishment and invigoration of life, the spiritual life being also presented under this twofold aspect in Scripture (Ps. xxiii., green pastures or meadows, and fresh waters). The Lord's Supper embraces both in one: it is the sacrament of the glorification of the new life derived from the bloody fountain of the atoning death of Jesus.

7. The *materia terrestris* and *cœlestis* in the Eucharist. Its religious and moral influence. Either salvation or condemnation.

8. For the history of the *rites* of the Lord's Supper, *see* the works on church history and archæology. The Church passed over from the use of unleavened to the use of leavened bread. Contentions arose, in consequence, between the Eastern and the Western Churches. Other differences concerning the kind of bread, the use and withdrawal of the wine, the posture (kneeling, standing, sitting) of the communicants, etc.

[9. It is a sad reflection, that the ordinance of the Lord's Supper, this feast of the *unio mystica* and *communio sanctorum*, which should bind all pious hearts to Christ and each other, and fill them with the holiest and tenderest affections, has been the innocent occasion of the bitterest and most violent passions, and the most uncharitable abuse. The eucharistic controversies, before and after the Reformation, are among the most unrefreshing and apparently fruitless in church history. Theologians will have much to answer for at the judgment-day, for having perverted the sacred feast of Divine love into an apple of discord. No wonder that Melanchthon's last wish and prayer was, to be delivered from the *rabies theologorum*. Fortunately, the blessing of the holy Communion does not depend upon the scientific interpretation and understanding of the words of institution—however desirable this may be—but upon the promise of the Lord, and upon childlike faith which receives it, though it may not fully understand the mystery of the ordinance. Christians celebrated it with most devotion and profit before they contended about the true meaning of those words, and obscured their vision by all sorts of scholastic theories and speculations. Fortunately, even now Christians of different denominations, and holding different opinions, can unite around the table of their common Lord and Saviour, and feel one with Him and in Him who died for them all, and feeds them with His life once sacrificed on the cross, but now living for ever. Let them hold fast to what they agree in, and charitably judge of their differences; looking hopefully forward to the marriage-supper of the Lamb in the kingdom of glory, when we shall understand and adore, in perfect harmony, the infinite mystery of the love of God in His Son our Saviour.—P. S.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The Passover and the Lord's Supper.—Both in their relation to circumcision and baptism.—The question of the disciples, *Where wilt Thou*, etc. (ver. 17)? an expression of their feelings and state: 1. Of their legal anxiety; 2. of their painful embarrassment and sad presentiments; 3. of their want of decision. —The disciples helped forward the doom of their Master: 1. unconsciously, and yet 2. inevitably.—(*a*) as instruments of the Lord, and (*b*) as representatives of mankind.—The Lord's silent guests.—The secret friends of God in all times concealed in Jerusalem, ready at the critical moment to do the Lord service (the friend at Bethphage, the friend in Jerusalem, Joseph of Arimathea, and Nicodemus).—*When it was evening* (ver. 20): the supper in the Egyptian night of fear, and in that of Mount Zion.—The feelings with which the Lord celebrates the institution of the Supper, in presence of the traitor: 1. The moral horror which shook His whole being; 2. the stern solemnity which amazed all the disciples; 3. the compassion which revealed itself in the severest self-denial; 4. a boldness of love which established the feast of heaven in spite of all the murmurs of hell.—The traitor amidst the preparations of the Passover; or, how hardness of heart ripens under the midday sun of tender love.—The deportment of the Lord toward the traitor, an everlasting type of all true ecclesiastical discipline: a holy frame of mind, a penetrating eye, a general, all-comprehensive judgment.—*One of you* (ver. 21).—The important question, *Is it I?* a question of preparation for the sacrament.—The decisive conflict at the table of grace, or the most quiet and the greatest victory of the Lord (*see* my *Leben Jesu*, ii. 3, p. 1327).—Judas, master of hypocritical dissimulation, unmasked by the Master of divine simplicity. 1. The points of development in his hypocrisy:—(*a*) his receiving the bag, and deceiving the disciples; (*b*) the pretence of care for the poor; (*c*) the question, *Is it I?* (*d*) the kiss. 2. His detection in its corresponding points of interest.—The institution of the Supper an expression of the Lord's supreme certainty of victory before His final

conflict.—How the Lord transfused the Old Testament into the New: 1. In all its parts generally; 2. in the institution of the Eucharist especially.—Christ present at the first supper, and present at all others: 1. Always present, *because* present the first time. He alone can distribute, interpret, and make it effectual. 2. Always present, *as* present the first time. Distinguished from the sacrament; presenting Himself in it.—The bread and the wine in their inseparable unity: 1. With each other: the broken body, the expiating blood; 2. one after the other: the assurance of reconciliation, the new life.—The Eucharist, the great feast of the Church: 1. A true feast (for the nourishment of the spiritual life); 2. a sacred feast (separating from all sinful enjoyment); 3. a covenant feast (sealing redemption); 4. a love feast (uniting the redeemed); 5. a supper feast (forefestival of death, of the end of the world, of the coming of Christ).—The Lord's Supper a glance of light into the new world of glory in the shadows of the present world: 1. A sure pledge that the old world is perishing as Christ's body was broken; 2. a sure pledge that the new world will appear penetrated by the eternal resurrection life of Christ.—*And when they had sung a hymn* (ver. 30).—The Christian enters upon his final conflict strengthened by the Supper: 1. Upon the deciding conflict of youth (over the brook Kedron); 2. upon the repeated conflicts of adult life (Gethsemane); 3. upon the final conflict of death (imprisonment and Calvary).—Judas the infinitely dark riddle of Christianity; Christ its eternally bright mystery.—The Lord's household company the figure and the germ of the Church.

Starke:—*Nov. Bibl. Tub.:* Out of the depths of the humiliation of Jesus stream forth the brightest rays of His Divine omniscience, and power over the human heart.—Happy he into whose heart Jesus comes! 1 Cor. v. 7, 8.—*Hedinger:* Is it marvellous that there should have been a wicked one, and a hypocrite, among the disciples?—We may publicly speak of prevailing sins, but should not mention the sinner by name.—*Cramer:* Many have enemies and traitors frequenting their tables.—*Osiander:* Foreknowledge and prediction do not make sinners sin, 1 Cor. xi. 27.—*Quesnel:* The communion of the body and blood of Christ a pledge of the fellowship of Heaven.—In the worthy participation our hope of perfect enjoyment of the transcendent blessings of the kingdom of glory is strengthened.—The Lord's Supper is a sacrament which must abide in the Church until the Lord comes.

Lisco:—In the glorified world a glorified feast.

Heubner:—Jesus was subject to the law, observed all the feasts as a perfect Israelite; thus approving Himself a true lover of His Church and His country.—To Him must all hearts and all doors fly open.—Love deals forbearingly with the greatest sinners.—The anxiety of the disciples a joy to Jesus.—The saints are always troubled lest sin should be lying hidden in their hearts.—The fact that all questioned, shows that they did not suspect Judas; they were deceived in him.—It was not with Judas as Terence says, *erubuit, salvus est.*—Where shame is, there is not yet full perdition.—The earthly supper a type and pledge of the heavenly.—Heaven an eternal feast of love and friendship.—Christ sang with his disciples; thus He sanctified Church psalmody.

F. W. Krummacher (*The Suffering Saviour*):—The institution of the Lord's Supper.—The doctrine of the Lord's Supper.—Judas Iscariot the New Testament Achitophel.—*Ahlfeld:* The Lord's Supper the means of grace, through which Jesus makes His abode in His Church and in us. Maunday Thursday.—*Harless:* The true guests at the Lord's table.—*Kern:* The holy Supper a Supper of the New Covenant.—*A. Knapp:* The Lord's Supper the holy of holies in the new dispensation.

[Quesnel:—(on ver. 17.) See here the extreme poverty of Christ, who had no house of His own on earth! He who would fain settle himself here, as in his native country, is not His disciple.—(Ver. 20.) The Son of God, in this last assembly, which contains an abridgment, as it were, of the whole church, shows us the mixture of the good, the weak, and the wicked, who are all united in the participation of the same sacraments [? this depends upon the unsettled question of the presence of Judas at the institution of the Lord's Supper].—(Ver. 21.) Prudence and charity require that we should use the greatest sinners tenderly to the last; admonishing without discovering them.—When a heart is once hardened, it has no longer any ears to hearken to admonitions. It is the property of hardness of heart to make us, like Judas, deaf, obdurate, and insensible, without perceiving that we are so.—(Ver. 26.) Holy and adorable words! which contain the establishment of the Christian worship, the institution of the new law, the contract of the true covenant, the testament of a dying Father, a commandment of the greatest importance, the foundation of a true religion, the substitution of reality in the room of shadows, and the end of all types and figures.—(Ver. 30.) A communion-day is a day entirely set apart for thanksgiving, adoration, and hymns of joy, which are to be the beginning of the hymns and anthems of eternity.—Burkitt:—On Judas: 1. His character: a professor of religion, a preacher, an apostle, one of the twelve; 2. his crime: he betrayed Jesus, a man, his master, his maker; 3. the cause and occasion: covetousness, the root sin, [add 4. his sad repentance (the worldly sorrow leading to death, contrasted with the godly sorrow of Peter unto life); 5. his terrible end].—(Ver. 23.) Eternal misery is much worse than non-entity. Better to have no being, than not to have a being in Christ.—The Lord's Supper: 1. The author: Jesus took bread; 2. the time of the institution: the night before He was betrayed; 3. the sacramental elements: bread and wine; 4. the ministerial action: the breaking of the bread and the blessing of the cup; 5. the object: Do this in remembrance of Me, etc.; 6. thanksgiving after communion.—Comp. similar reflections and suggestions in Matthew Henry, Thomas Scott, Ph. Doddridge, and other practical commentators.—P. S.]

FOURTH SECTION.

PROMISES TO THE DISCIPLES; AND CHRIST IN GETHSEMANE.

CHAPTER XXVI. 31–46.

(Mark xiv. 27–42; Luke xxii. 31–46; John xiii. 36–xviii. 1.)

31 Then [in going out to the Mount of Olives] saith Jesus unto them, All ye shall [will] be
offended because of me [at me] this night: for it is written, I will smite the Shepherd,
32 and the sheep of the flock shall be scattered abroad (Zech. xiii. 7). But after I am
33 risen again, I will go before you into Galilee. Peter answered and said unto him,
Though all *men* shall be offended because of thee [at thee],[1] *yet* will I never be offended.
34 Jesus said unto him, Verily I say unto thee, That this night, before the [a] cock crow
35 [crows], thou shalt deny me thrice. Peter said unto him, Though I should die with
thee, yet will I not [in no wise, οὐ μή] deny thee.[2] [But][3] Likewise also said all the
disciples.
36 Then cometh Jesus with them unto a place called Gethsemane, and saith unto the
37 disciples, Sit ye here, while I go and pray yonder. And he took with him Peter and
the two sons of Zebedee, and began to be sorrowful and very heavy [full of, or,
38 overwhelmed with, sorrow and anguish, λυπεῖσθαι καὶ ἀδημονεῖν].[4] Then saith he
unto them, My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death: tarry ye here, and watch
39 with me. And he went a little farther,[5] and fell on his face, and prayed, saying, O my
Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me: nevertheless, not as I will, but as
40 thou *wilt*. And he cometh unto the disciples, and findeth them asleep, and saith unto
41 Peter, What,[6] could ye not [then, οὕτως] watch with me one hour? Watch and pray,
that ye enter not into temptation: the spirit indeed *is* willing, but the flesh *is* weak.
42 He went away again the second time, and prayed, saying, O my Father, if this cup[7]
43 may not pass away from me,[8] except I drink it, thy will be done. And he came and
44 [again] found them asleep again:[9] for their eyes were heavy. And he left them, and
45 went away again, and prayed the third time,[10] saying the same words. Then cometh
he to his disciples, and saith unto them, Sleep on now, and take *your* rest: behold, the
46 hour is at hand, and the Son of man is betrayed into the hands of sinners. Rise, let us
be going: behold, he is at hand that doth betray me.

[1] Ver. 33.—Εἰ (καὶ) πάντες σκανδαλισθήσονται ἐν σοί. Καί is omitted in A., B., C., D., etc., Lachmann, and Tischendorf.

[2] Ver. 35.—Codd. A., E., G., al., read the somewhat milder subj. ἀπαρνήσωμαι [for ἀπαρνήσομαι]. Probably a gloss.

[3] Ver. 35.—Several uncial Codd. add δέ. Probably from Mark xiv. 31. [*But* implies here an extenuation of the guilt of Peter, as much as to say, Peter made these professions, but *we* all did the same, and have nothing to boast of. But Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Alford omit it.—P. S.]

[4] Ver. 37.—[Lange: ZU TRAUERN (*schaudern*) UND ZU BANGEN (*beben*). Doddridge complains that "the words which our translators use here, are very flat, and fall short of the emphasis of those terms in which the Evangelists describe this awful scene." The verb ἀδημονεῖν is derived by some from δῆμος, people, and the alpha privativum, hence, to feel lonely, solitary; expression of a sorrow that makes man unfit for company and shunning it, and pressing like a weight of lead upon the soul. F. H. Scrivener (*A Supplement to the Authorized English Version of the N. T.*, London, 1845, vol. i. p. 304) thinks that no single Greek word can be more expressive of deep dejection than ἀδημονεῖν, and renders it: "*to be overwhelmed with anguish*." Tyndale and Coverdale: *grievously troubled*. Conant less forcibly: *troubled*. Meyer seems to agree with Suidas' definition of ἀδημ. = λίαν λυπεῖσθαι, and adds: "*Es bezeichnet die unheimliche Beunruhigung der Angst und Verlegenheit*." I regret, that the scholarly work of Scrivener, just alluded to, has not sooner come to hand. It would have been of considerable assistance to me in the Critical Notes on the English Version.—P. S.]

[5] Ver. 39.—The reading προσελθών [for προελθών] is probably a writing error. [Cod. Sinait. likewise reads προσελθών.]

[6] Ver. 40.—[*What!* is an interpolation and, as Conant remarks, "violates the tone of feeling and manner of the Saviour." The οὕτως can best be rendered by *then*. Lange: *So also*.—P. S.]

[7] Ver. 42.—Many Codd., A., B., C., etc., [also Cod. Sinait.], read here only τοῦτο without ποτήριον, which seems to be supplemented from ver. 39, and is omitted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, [and Alford].

[8] Ver. 42.—Codd. B., D., etc., [also Cod. Sinait.], omit the words: ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, *from me*. [Lange puts them in brackets.]

[9] Ver. 43.—Lachmann, Tischendorf, [Tregelles, Alford], read with the best authorities, [including Cod. Sinait.] πάλιν εὗρεν (*again found*) αὐτούς [instead of εὑρίσκει αὐτοὺς πάλιν, *finds them again*].

[10] Ver. 44.—A., D., K., omit ἐκ τρίτου. Lachmann puts it in brackets, Tischendorf omits it. [In the large ed. of 1859 Tischendorf retains the words in the text, but Alford omits them. Cod. Sinait. has them, but between τὸν αὐτὸν and λόγον, instead of before τὸν αὐτόν.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 31. **Then saith Jesus unto them,** τότε.—For a time Jesus remained in the room of the Passover, as is evident from John xiv. 31. At this point comes the departure from the house. The prediction of the flight of the disciples and of Peter's denial took place, according to John xiii. 37, in the Passover-room itself. Hereupon followed the farewell discourses, John xiii. to xvii., spoken partly within the room, and partly on the way to Gethsemane.

Will be offended at Me, σκανδαλισθήσεσθε ἐν ἐμοί.—That is, My sufferings ye will make an offence and snare to yourselves.

For it is written.—What the Lord knew by immediate prevision, He nevertheless connects with a prophetic word: partly for the sake of the disciples, partly on account of His relation to the law; and further to prove that the course of His suffering was not contrary to Old Testament predictions, but that the carnal notions of the Jews as to a Messiah exempt from suffering were in direct contradiction to the Old Testament. The passage, Zech. xiii. 7: "*Awake, O sword, against My shepherd, and against the man that is My fellow [My equal], saith the Lord of hosts: smite the Shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered; and I will turn Mine hand upon the little ones,*"—is indeed quoted freely,* yet not inconsistently with the connection of the text. In the original, Jehovah commands the sword to smite His Shepherd; but here He appears to lift up the sword Himself. The Messianic import of the passage is without reason resolved by Meyer (after Hitzig) into a merely typical significance. For the passage is closely connected with Zechariah's previous reference to a future time, when prophecy should be silenced, and when he who should arise as a prophet would be exposed to the most bitter sufferings. That prediction stretched forward beyond the prophetless period after Malachi to the period of the new prophets, John the Baptist and Christ. But if we recognize the prophetical spirit in this passage at all, we cannot refer it to John the Baptist. It foretold, however, the universal dispersion of the people in consequence of their rejection of Christ. "The Shepherd indicated by the prophet is the same who, in ch. xi. 4, feeds the miserable sheep, the Jewish people; His death is the sign for the scattering of the flock, yet the Lord immediately stretches out His hand to save the little ones, the faithful, His disciples. Hence the profound meaning of the passage is this: When the Jewish people had rejected their last Deliverer and Saviour, they underwent the punishment of dispersion. This was preparatorily typified in the actual scattering of the disciples on the death of Jesus; just as their eternal salvation in their bodily deliverance when Jesus was taken" (John xviii. 9). Gerlach.†

Ver. 32. **Go before you into Galilee.**—Meyer denies the genuineness of this declaration, for the groundless reason, that Jesus could not so definitely predict His own resurrection. The announcement of a particular meeting in Galilee, does not exclude the previous appearances of Jesus to the disciples in Jerusalem. He says this to those who had come with Him from Galilee to the feast: "Before ye shall have returned to your homes, I will rise again." In Galilee He collected together again all the scattered disciples: ch. xxviii. 16; John xxi.; 1 Cor. xv. 6. Gerlach. [The Lord seems to allude in this comforting prediction to the remaining words of the prophecy of Zech. xiii. 7: "*And I will turn Mine hand upon the little ones.*" *To go before*, προάγειν, is a *verbum pastorale*, as Bengel remarks, comp. John. x. 4.—P. S.]

Ver. 34. **Before a cock crows.**—De Wette: "If Jesus said these words, He meant merely (de Wette's mere assertion) the division of the night called ἀλεκτοροφωνία, קְרִיאַת הַגֶּבֶר; but the Evangelists referred it to a real cock-crowing." Gerlach: "Before the cock-crowing between midnight and morning. But it came to pass literally, like so many other predictions." It must be regarded as fixed, that the definite specification of that time of the night was the main point; but since, where cocks were found, their cry would not be wanting, we must hold fast the circumstance, that the cock-crowing was appointed to be the warning sound for Peter. Meyer seems to suppose that the first cock-crowing took place at midnight, and the second about three in the morning. It is not established that the ἀλεκτοροφωνία marked always the time from midnight till three; since the Talmudists reckoned only three divisions of the day, and regarded the fourth, πρωΐ, as the morning of the day following. Comp. Winer, sub *Nachtwache*.*

Deny Me thrice.—De Wette: Deny knowing Me (!). Better Meyer: Deny that thou belongest to Me. But the denial of faith in Christ, the Son of God, is contained in it; and not merely the denial of a personal relation.

Ver. 36. **Gethsemane.**—Most probably גַּת שְׁמָנָא *oil-press*. The most approved form is Γεθσημανεί: *see* de Wette. A piece of land at the foot of the Mount of Olives, which was provided with a press, and perhaps also with a dwelling-house, or at least the usual garden-tower. *See* Winer and Robinson. Through the Stephen Gate or the Gate of Mary (according to Schulz, identical with the ancient Fish Gate), there is a descent to the valley of Kedron, by which the traveller went over the bridge of the same name into the garden of Gethsemane. Kedron means Black brook; it flowed with perturbed waters, which were still more darkened by the blood of the temple-sacrifices, down through the valley toward the Dead Sea. Gethsemane lay on the right of the path to the Mount of Olives. It scarcely deserves now the name of a garden, as the place is covered with stones, and there are only eight old olive trees remaining. The place is in possession of the Franciscans, who in 1847 erected a new wall around it, in length two hundred paces, and in breadth one hundred and fifty.

* [The quotation is verbatim after the Alexandrian MS. of the LXX., except that the imperative πάταξον, *strike*, is changed into the future πατάξω, *I will strike*, God who *commands* the striking into God who *strikes Himself*.—P. S.]

† [Comp. here STIER, *Reden Jesu*, vi. 176 sqq., who goes at length into the meaning of this prophecy, and especially the word עֲמִיתִי, "*my fellow*," "*my equal*," *i. e.*, the Messiah. Also Nast *ad loc.*—P. S.]

* [The difficulty derived from the Mishna, that the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and the priests everywhere, were forbidden to keep fowls, because they scratched up unclean worms, is easily removed, first, in view of the inconsistency of the Talmud on this point (*see* Lightfoot), and secondly, by the consideration that such a prohibition could in no case affect the Roman residents, over whom the Jews had no power. The scarcity of cocks in Jerusalem is, however, intimated by the absence of the definite article before ἀλέκτωρ in all the four Gospels. Hence it should be omitted in the English Version, vers. 34, 74, 75; Mark xiv. 30, 68, 72; Luke xxii. 34, 60, 61; John xiii. 38; xviii. 27. At any rate the whole history of Peter's denial is evidently drawn from real life, and presents one of the strongest evidences for the originality and truthfulness of the Gospel records.—P. S.]

There is no ground for doubting the identity of the present and the ancient Gethsemane; yet it must be confessed that there is no reason why the place on the left of the road may not be preferred (Wolff). C. von Raumer: "The olives are not of the time of our Lord; for Titus, during the siege of Jerusalem, had all the trees of the district cut down; and, moreover, the tenth legion were encamped on the western declivity of the mountain. The great age of the eight trees is inferred from the fact, that each of them pays a particular tribute which goes up to the time of the capture of Jerusalem by the Saracens (A. D. 636).*

And He saith to the disciples.—There were eight of them; the three selected ones, and Judas, being excluded. Only those three, who had seen His transfiguration on the Mount, might be witnesses of the conflict of His soul. But this appointment of Christ formed also a kind of watch against premature surprise on the part of the traitor. In the foreground of the garden sat the eight disciples; beyond them are the three confidential ones; into the Holiest of His Passion He goes alone. These stations are not without symbolical significance.†

Ver. 37. **He began to be overwhelmed with sorrow and anguish** (*to mourn* and *to tremble*); λυπεῖσθαι καὶ ἀδημονεῖν.—Suidas explains ἀδημονεῖν to be λίαν λυπεῖσθαι, ἀπορεῖν. But the latter expression is probably not an intensification of the former; it is a kind of contrast to it. Λυπεῖσθαι is the passive: being troubled or afflicted. Thus it signifies, absolutely taken, the experience of an infinitely afflicting influence. All the woe of the world falls upon Him, and oppresses His heart. Mark has the stronger expression: ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι. The contradictory impressions ‡ which Christ experienced extended to horror and amazement. Ἀδημονεῖν, on the other hand, related to ἀπορεῖν—according to Buttmann from ἄδημος—expresses in the absolute sense the being forsaken of all the world and bereft of every consolation, the uttermost anxiety and experience of woe.

Ver. 38. **My soul is exceeding sorrowful,** or **girt round with sorrow,** περίλυπος.—Compare John xii. 27. The soul is the intermediate in man between body and spirit. The spirit expresses the relation to God; the body, the relation to earth; the soul, the relation to the world at large, especially the world of spirits. Hence the soul is the specific organ of spiritual experiences and emotions of pleasure and sorrow (BECK, *Bibl. Seelenlehre*, 10).—**Even unto death.**—The extremest degree. Even unto death, so that sorrow might bring Me to death, Jon. iv. 9. "Anguish even unto death, the woes of one struggling with death, I now experience. The words of Ps. xxii. 16; xl. 13, seem to have been present to His thoughts." Gerlach.

Tarry ye here, and watch with Me.—Intimation of the deepest agony. Bengel: *In magnis tentationibus juvat solitudo, sed tamen ut in propinquo sint amici.*

Ver. 39. **And He went a little farther.**—Μικρόν belongs to προελθών, a little distance. Luke gives here the vivid and dramatic statements of the spiritual excitement of the Lord,—of the bloody or blood-like sweat which poured from Him,—of His being strengthened by an angel. *See Com. on Luke* xxii. 41-44.

If it be possible.—Not as opposing the notion of an unbending decree; but in living harmony with the Father's government and perfect submission. Luke: εἰ βούλει. The πάντα δυνατά σοι in Mark is no contradiction.

This cup.—The suffering is a cup filled with a bitter potion. *See* above, ch. xx. 22. Meyer (after de Wette): "This suffering and dying now before Me." The signification of the cup is the same as the signification of the suffering of His soul. But the modern interpretation, of an anguish in the presence of death which extorted a prayer for its removal, is in opposition to all the earlier declarations of Christ, and especially to the institution of the Supper, and the high-priestly prayer, John xvii: On this farther on.

But as Thou.—As Thou wilt, let it be. *See* Mark. Not My will, but Thine be done. "The feeling of profound emotion speaks in broken language." Meyer. [This passage figures very prominently in the Monothelite controversy as one of the principal proofs that Christ had two wills, a human and a divine, as He had two natures. It should not be overlooked, however, that the contrast is not as between His human and His divine will, but as between His will (as the God-Man in the state of humiliation and intense agony) and the will of His heavenly Father.—P. S.]

Ver. 40. **And findeth them sleeping.**—"The sleeping of *the disciples*, and of *these three favorite* disciples, under *these* circumstances, and with so *unconquerable* a drowsiness, is psychologically mysterious, even after Luke's explanation, ἀπὸ τῆς λύπης (ch. xxii. 45); but the certainly genuine words of Jesus, vers. 40 and 45, constrain us to regard the circumstance as historically true." Meyer. We must connect with this the equally mysterious sleeping of the same three men during the transfiguration; and this will confirm the supposition, that higher spiritual influences and transactions almost overpowered the feeble flesh. Yet the Lord expressly declares that the disciples were morally responsible for being in such a condition. An analogous influence we see under preaching. Sermons stimulate some, and send others to sleep, according to their several dispositions and preparation. The simple law, that extraordinary tension raises the highly developed spiritual life, while it stupefies the less developed, finds here its strongest illustration in the most absolute contrast of spiritual watchfulness and sleep.

He saith unto Peter.—He had promised most; was in the greatest danger; and probably he was in psychical respects the strongest.—**So then,** οὕτως,—with displeasure: with allusion to his great promises.—**Not one hour.**—Incidental intimation of the duration of our Lord's first conflict.

Ver. 41. **That ye enter not into temptation;** εἰσέλθητε.—That the situation in which they

* [Dr. Wordsworth, following the ancient fathers and the older Protestant commentators, sees a providential and prophetical adaptation of the names of Scripture localities generally, and of *Gethsemane* in particular, to the events which occurred there. In this *oil press*, in which the olives were crushed and bruised, Christ was bruised for our sins, that oil might flow from His wounds to heal our souls. Comp. Matthew Henry: "There He trod the wine-press of His Father's wrath, and trod it alone." In like manner Wordsworth allegorizes on *Bethlehem*, the house of bread, where the bread of life was born; *Nazareth*, where He grew up as a branch; *Bethsaida*, the house of fishing, where He called the apostles; *Capernaum*, the house of consolation, where He dwelt; *Bethany*, the place of palm-dates, which speaks of the palms and hosannahs of His triumphal entry into Jerusalem; *Bethphage*, the house of figs, which is a memento of the withering of the barren fig-tree; the *Mount of Olives*, whence Christ ascended to heaven, to hold forth the olive branch of peace between God and man.—P. S.]

† [The Edinb. transl. has *insignificance*.—P. S.]

‡ [Not: *passions*, as in the Edinb. transl.—P. S.]

would soon be placed, might not be a cause of offence to them, through lack of their own preparation. The simple test, which comes from God alone, becomes πειρασμός, an assault dangerous to the soul, partly through the accession of tempting influences from without ("the devil, the world"), and partly through a blameable internal bias ("our own flesh and blood"). The Lord's words were fully explained when the band soon afterward came upon them.

The spirit indeed is willing.—A general declaration; but, like the passage, Rom. vii. 22, 25, qualified and particularized by its relation to the disciples, and the progress of the Christian life. In the unconverted the willingness of the πνεῦμα is not yet unbound; in mature Christians the σάρξ is purified and governed by the spiritual principle. But, even in the first case, the willingness of the spirit is faintly expressed in indefinite desires; and in the last case, the opposition of the flesh is not absolutely suppressed and abolished until the consummation. The proper conflict between the πνεῦμα, the higher principle of life, and the old ungodly nature, falls into the domain of the Christian discipleship, the life that is being matured. The πνεῦμα is here the human spiritual life, awakened by the Holy Spirit. It is not only willing, but πρόθυμον, ready and willing. The σάρξ which opposes is not simply the sensual nature, but the sensuous nature disordered by the ψυχή. The Scripture presents the σάρξ,—that is, the natural life in its inclinations and impulses,—in three stages: 1. As innocent σάρξ (Gen. ii.); 2. as sinful σάρξ (Gen. vi.); 3. as sanctified σάρξ (John vi.). But the sinful σάρξ is even in the regenerate excited to a diseased contradiction; it is not merely weak, but ἀσθενής, as the πνεῦμα is πρόθυμον. Hence, above all things, watchfulness is needed. Calovius: σάρξ is here the *homo animalis; πνεῦμα*, the *homo spiritualis*. This is too dogmatical. [Stier, Alford, and Nast take *flesh* here in its original sense as a constituent part of human nature, which in itself is not sinful, but has an inherent weakness, which the *soul*, standing between the *spirit* and the *flesh*, must overcome by deriving strength from the *spirit* through *watching* and *prayer*. They also maintain that Christ Himself is included in this declaration, with the difference that He gave as high and pre-eminent an example of its truth, as the disciples afforded a low and ignoble one: He, in the willingness of the spirit, yielding Himself to the Father's will to suffer and die, but weighed down by the weakness of the flesh; they, having professed, and really having, a willing spirit to suffer with Him, but, even in the one hour's watching, overcome by the burden of drowsiness. Observe, it is here πνεῦμα, the higher spiritual being, and not ψυχή, the human soul, the seat of the affections and passions, as in ver. 38 and John xii. 27.—P. S.]

Ver. 42. **Again the second time.**—No pleonasm. The ἐκ δευτέρου defines the ἀπελθών; the πάλιν defines the προσηύξατο in a significant manner. In the second supplication, the resignation and self-sacrifice comes more prominently forward.

Ver. 44. **The third time.**—Apart from the textual uncertainty, this presents no difficulty. It is in harmony with life, and especially spiritual life, that intense and decisive conflicts develop themselves in a succession of acts, with intermissions of pause. The rhythm here assumes a threefold rise and fall, according to the nature of the spirit and of spiritual conflict, as in the conflict of the Apostle Paul, 2 Cor. xii. 8. Luke does not record this threefold repetition literally; but he describes it in the growing intensity of the struggle, the bloody sweat, and the word of the strengthening angel.

Ver. 45. **Sleep on now, and take your rest.**—1. Chrysostom, Grotius, Winer, and others: "Jesus needed no longer the co-operation of His disciples, and gives them rest." But, on the other hand, we read: "The hour is come." 2. H. Stephanus, Heumann, [also Greswell and Robinson], and others, make it a question: Sleep ye still? but this is opposed by τὸ λοιπόν. 3. Grulich (on the *Irony of Christ*, p. 74): Sleep and take your rest for the time to come, that is, in future, when ye shall have more security. But this would not be τὸ λοιπόν. 4. Euthymius Zigab., [Calvin], and Beza, call it "rebuking irony." [Also Chrysostom.] Meyer: "The common objection against the ironical view, that it is not in harmony with the present feeling of Jesus, is psychologically arbitrary. The profoundest grief of soul, especially when associated with such clearness of spirit, has its own irony. And what an apathy had Jesus here to encounter!" But if the essential principle of irony is security and perfect composure of spirit, we recognize here the sacred irony which does not speak in contempt of weakness, but in the triumphant consciousness that the fight was already won. Another token is, that it passes over at once into the most solemn language. *See* the divine irony in Ps. ii. Meanwhile, we must be careful not to overlook the symbolical element in the saying. The disciples had slept in the body, because they slept in the spirit. And, because they had not watched, there was a necessity now that they should outwardly watch while they slept on in spirit, until they were awakened by the cock-crowing, the Redeemer's death, and the resurrection morning.

The hour is at hand.—The great hour of decision. Comp. Luke xxii. 53.

Shall be betrayed into the hands of sinners.—Grotius: The Romans. Meyer: The Sanhedrin. De Wette, better: The Romans and the Jews. For that the betrayal was twofold, Jesus had before declared.

Ver. 46. **Arise, let us go hence.**—"Remark the haste which is expressed in ἐγείρεσθε, ἄγωμεν, ἰδού." Meyer.

The Relation of the Three Evangelists to John.—The silence of John upon the conflict in Gethsemane has been explained in various ways. According to Olshausen and others, he took for granted an acquaintance with the synoptical narratives. I have explained the omission of this event, as well as of the institution of the Lord's Supper, from the peculiar composition and aim of the fourth Gospel, with reference to the three already existing.* So also Meyer. John has something analogous to the agony of Gethsemane in the spiritual conflict of Jesus in the temple, John xii. 27, though the two are of course not to be identified.

* [The Edinb. edition altogether misunderstands this passage, and translates: "*The issue* (as if *Ausfall* was the same with *Ausgang!*) *of this event . . . are illustrated by John in his own way.*" John does not illustrate these events at all, but passes them by in complete silence. But Lange illustrates this silence in his *Leben Jesu*, to which he here alludes.—P. S.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The perfect fidelity of Jesus to the law is seen in His not going over the Mount of Olives to Bethany. It was necessary for every one to spend that night in Jerusalem. His calmness is seen in the fact of His going to His accustomed place of prayer (Luke xxii. 39), although knowing that Judas was acquainted with the place. The time for hiding Himself was past; for throughout the whole land there was no longer freedom for His steps. But no more did Jesus go prematurely to meet danger, which He would have done had He celebrated the Passover a day earlier than usual. "Just at the commencement of His public teaching (ch. iv.), He retired, before His extremest agony, into silence; that there He might in prayer await and overcome in His inmost spirit the fiercest assaults of Satan (John xiv. 30), before He entered upon His external mortal passion." Gerlach.

2. *The Agony of the Saviour in Gethsemane.*—The final form of an anxious presentiment which had pervaded His whole public life, and which constantly came out more and more distinctly into utterance: Luke xii. 50; Mark viii. 12; John xii. There is nothing improbable, though something mysterious and wonderful, in the record that Christ's agony followed the high festival of His soul in the sacerdotal prayer (John xvii.). A similar transition in feeling often appears: 1. From joy to sorrow in the entry with palm-branches in Luke, in the temple, John xii., in Gethsemane; 2. from sorrow to joy at the departure from Galilee, at the dismissal of Judas from the company of disciples, John xiii., after the cry, "My God, My God," on the cross. All this shows the elasticity and absolute depth and vigor of His inner life. We distinguish three great conflicts and triumphs in the passion: 1. The victory over the temptation of the kingdom of darkness *in His Spirit*, at the institution of the holy Supper (John xiii. 31); 2. the victory over temptation *in His soul*, in Gethsemane; 3. the victory over temptation *in His bodily life*, on the cross. These three great crises, indeed, are not to be separated abstractly, as if in the one case His spirit only was tried, in the other, His soul, etc. But the assault made the life of the spirit the medium of trial in the one case, in the other, the life of the soul; and the victory which preceded became an advantage in the conflict which followed. And this serves to show the real import of the specific suffering of the soul of our Lord. It is in its nature one of the deepest mysteries of the evangelic history; but it receives some light from the position of the soul-conflict between the spirit-conflict and the conflict of bodily distress, from its relation to the temptation in the wilderness, and by definite declarations of Christ Himself. Interpretations:—1. Origen, *De martyrio*, c. 29: Christ desired a yet deeper suffering; an ascetically strained view.* *Contra Celsum:* He would have averted the destruction of Jerusalem. So Ambrose, Basil, Jerome. 2. He suffered the wrath of God in our stead and our behalf. Melanchthon: *Jacuit filius Dei prostratus coram æterno Patre, sentiens iram adversus tua et mea peccata.* So Rambach, "the cup of wrath." 3. Assaults of hell. Knapp: "The last and most terrible attacks of the kingdom of darkness, in which the prince of death sought to wrest from Him the victory." 4. Ebrard: "His trembling in Gethsemane was not dread of His sufferings, but was part of His passion itself; it was not a transcendental and external assumption of a foreign guilt, but a concrete experience of the full and concentrated power of the world's sin." 5. Olshausen: Actual abandonment on the part of God; the human ψυχή of Jesus alone was in conflict here, while the fulness of the divine life had withdrawn. 6. Rationalists like Thiess and Paulus refer it to physical illness and exhaustion,* to which Schuster adds the distress of abandonment by friends.† 7. De Wette: Fear of death ("a moral weakness!"). 8. Meyer: Horror and shudder in confronting the terror of such cruel sufferings and death. So most modern interpreters. Neander proves against Strauss that a change of feeling in the life of the Saviour is by no means improbable. But we cannot admit a change of thought, least of all a change of the fundamental thoughts of His life. A supplication for the turning away of the suffering of death, even as a conditional and resigned request, is not to be imagined after so many foreannouncements of His passion, after the institution of the Supper, and His continuance in the scene of danger at Gethsemane. This would be to make Jesus directly contradict Himself. The agony in Gethsemane was not dread of the agony on Calvary, but it was a *specific agony* of itself; therefore He prays, according to Mark, that, if it were possible, the hour of *this* suffering might pass,—similarly as in John.

It was the hour of nameless woe, of an excitement and commotion of soul,‡ in which He would not appear before His disciples, in which He could not appear before His enemies. 1. It was then first a specific *conflict of soul* ("My soul is surrounded by sorrow," περίλυπος): He was assaulted by the severest experience of woe and distressing anxiety. And this disposes of the opinions of those who make the suffering either predominantly pneumatic, or predominantly corporeal. 2. It was a counterpart to the temptation in the wilderness. *See* Luke iv. 13. Christ was tempted in the wilderness by the pseudo-messianic and carnal hopes and desires of His people, in connection with the vanities of the world. But in Gethsemane He was tempted by the pseudo-messianic, carnal grief and disappointment of His people, and the whole misery of the world, which culminated in the fearful treachery of Judas, and revealed itself in a milder form in the sleeping of the disciples for sor-

* [Origen explains the words: "*My soul is sorrowful unto death.* Sorrow is begun in me, but not to endure forever, but only till the hour of death; when I shall die for sin, I shall die also for all sorrow, whose beginnings only are in me."—P. S.]

* [In German: *körperliche Abspannung*, which is just the reverse of "corporeal *intensity of feeling*," as the Edinb. edition renders it.—P. S.]

† [Renan, in his *Life of Jesus*, ch. xxiii., adds the sad memory of "the clear fountains of Galilee, where He might have refreshed Himself; the vineyard and fig-tree, under which He might have been seated; and (hear, hear!) the young maidens who might perhaps have consented to love Him!" Only a French novel-writer would profane this sacred scene by such erotic sentimentalism. Renan places the agony in Gethsemane several days before the night of the Passion, contrary to the unanimous testimony of the Synoptists as well as the inherent probability of the case. But his opinions on such subjects are worth nothing at all.—P. S.]

‡ [In German: *Gemüthserschütterung. Gemüth* is here, like the Greek θυμός (from θύω, *to rush on, to storm; to burn in sacrifice*), the inmost soul, as the principle of life, feeling, and thought, especially as the seat of strong feeling and passion. The Edinb. edition obliterates the meaning of the original by turning it into: *unrest and amazement*, which is no translation at all. The next sentences are still more diluted and mutilated, or entirely omitted.—P. S.]

row. The whole tempting power of the desperation of humanity pressed hard upon Jesus: that was His λυπεῖσθαι. And in His own internal defence He stood alone, invigorated by no sympathy and help of mortals: that was His ἀδημονεῖν.—Comp. Isa. lxiii. 3. In this temptation through the despair of humanity lay indeed the strength of the fiercest assault of hellish powers upon His lonely soul. It was also the judgment of God upon humanity which Jesus experienced in His soul; not God's judgment upon Himself, but a judgment upon humanity, which He received into His own soul, in order to change it into redemption. Of the former—the despair of the world—Judas' treachery was the concentrated and terrific expression: it was the demoniac fruit of his demoniac grief, an act of mad contempt of salvation and of self. Hence the Lord again alludes here to the traitor (ver. 46). The great double-betrayal of His people and of the whole world committed against His life, was the extreme suffering of the Saviour, the fulfilment of Joseph's type, sold with fearful anguish on his part by his brothers (Gen. xlii. 21). Thus the agony of Jesus' soul in the garden was related to the despairing sorrow of the world, as the victory in the wilderness was related to the enticing and disguised pleasures of this world.

3. *Not as I will, but as Thou wilt.*—Opposed to the Monothelite heresy. This preserves the truth and truly human character of His conflict, without disparaging His constant accordance in all things with the will of the Father. Contrast and suspense do not amount to contradiction. Difference is not discord. *See* the decrees of the Council of Constantinople, A. D. 680.

4. Christ, in His threefold supplication in Gethsemane, perfected the doctrine of *prayer*, and sanctified the prayers of sinners. His petition rises from the full expression of His woe to the full expression of submission to the Father's will. And His being heard consisted in this, that in the Father's strength He drank the cup, and enjoyed the perfect security of victory before the sharpest conflict took place.

5. It was not the treachery of Judas in its external aspect, but that treachery as the expression of the disciples' and the world's sorrow and disappointment and of their despair of Christ's honor and victory, that constituted the temptation which the Saviour here suffered. But He had overcome this temptation already, when the external and actual betrayal came upon Him.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

I. THE TWO SECTIONS.—The passage from the Supper to Gethsemane; or, spiritual invigoration experienced in the way of duty: *a.* The appointment of spiritual strengthening; *b.* how it is experienced by Christ and by His disciples.—The warning voice of their Master scarcely heard amidst the expressions of the disciples' self-confidence.—Divine and human care in provision against assaults at hand: 1. Christ is careful, and therefore free from care; 2. His disciples were careless, and therefore burdened with care and anxiety.—Christ in His work of redemption overcame the unfaithfulness of His disciples: 1. Their unbelief in its presumption; 2. their unbelief in its despondency.—The sudden and decisive turning-point: 1. Of destiny; 2. of feeling; 3. of the issue.–The watchman and the sleepers: 1. God and men; 2. Christ and the disciples; 3. the spirit and the earthly cares.

II. THE WAY TO THE MOUNT OF OLIVES.—The fore-announcement of the Lord, and the unbelief of the disciples.—The spirit of Christ and the spirit of Scripture of one accord in their judgment upon the weakness of believers.—The promise of seeing them again in Galilee, bound up with the prediction of their coming fall: 1. A testimony of His supreme hope above His sorrows; 2. of His continued faithfulness to the disciples in their wavering.—The assurances of Peter.—His self-complacent boasts the token of his deep fall.—Mark his presumptuous and boasted superiority: 1. To his enemies: 2. to the other disciples; 3. to the warning word of his Master.—Strong professions, miserable apostacy.*—The last unholy contention of the disciples.—The measure of our false self-estimation the measure of our humiliation in life.—Night and the offence.—The strength of fidelity which can look beyond and overlook the offence of weakness, and turn it to salvation.—The offence of weakness (Peter), and the offence of wickedness (Judas).

III. GETHSEMANE.—The Mount of Olives and the Oil-Press (Gethsemane), symbols of the production and maturity of the Christian life: 1. The mount is a figure of the Church, in which the spiritual life grows; 2. the oil-press is a figure of suffering, through which the spiritual life is purged or set free.—The three great things of eternal significance connected with the Mount of Olives: 1. The palm-entry into Jerusalem; 2. Gethsemane; 3. the ascension.—Gethsemane the turning-point between the old and the new Paradise.—The reserve and the familiarity of Jesus in His agony.—The concealment of the agony: 1. It is altogether hidden from the world; 2. the greater number of His disciples see only the signs of this suffering; 3. the confidential ones only see it in amazement and trembling; 4. only God views Him stretched out, as a worm in the dust.—The soul of Jesus oppressed by the distress of all, and bereft of the help of all.—Or, the soul of the agonized treader of the wine-press (Isa. lxiii. 3); alone in His suffering, over whom all the billows roll (Ps. xxii. 21; Isa. liv. 11); resigned entirely to God, and hidden in Him (Ps. xxvii. 5).—How Christ in the garden overcame the sorrow of all the world: 1. Human sorrow, in its vain imaginations and despair; 2. devilish sorrow, in its betrayal and mockery.—The conflict in the wilderness, and the conflict in the garden.—The three great conflicts of Jesus: at the Supper, in Gethsemane, and on Calvary.—Gethsemane and Calvary.—The horror of Jesus in prospect of the kiss of Judas.—The Judas-kiss evermore the bitterest cup of the Lord and of His Church.—The world gave Him toil; His disciples gave Him trouble.—The suffering of Christ the suffering of priestly sympathy with the misery of the world: 1. He feels its perfect woe; hence His suffering. 2. He experiences the whole power of sin in this woe; hence the dread assault and conflict. 3. He begins to expiate its whole guilt in this woe: hence His persevering prayer.—Even in the agony of His soul He is the Christ: 1. The prophetic Revealer of all the depths of man's misery; 2. the high-priestly Expiator of them; 3. the kingly Deliverer from them.—The severest suffering is but a cup: 1. Rigorously measured; 2. surrounded and adorned by the cup; 3. prepared, presented and blessed by the Father.—Christ in the apparent anni-

* [In German: *Die starken Zusagen und die kläglichen Absagen*,—a paronomasia which I cannot imitate in English.—P. S.]

hilation of the work of His life: the seeming invalidation of His mission; the seeming dissolution of His company; the seeming succumbing of His disciples under grief, despondency, and self-reprobation; the seeming contempt of His love.—His faithful heart the dove with the olive-branch high above the floods.—Christ in His great conflict of prayer: teaches us to pray; makes our prayer acceptable; and becomes its Mediator.—Prayer is most acceptable in its absolute submission to the will of God.—The disciples as the outposts and watchmen of the Church.—The sleep of the disciples; or, the death-like collapse which follows over-strained self-confidence.—The two divisions of the disciples: a watch-company toward the world, and a watch-company around the Lord.—The Lord's request to His disciples a token of infinite humility.—The three words of the Lord to the disciples: 1. Watch with Me; 2. watch for yourselves; 3. sleep on now (whether waking or sleeping, ye will sleep till the awakening of My resurrection).—*Watch and pray*, because of: 1. Temptation; 2. weakness.—The three witnesses of His transfiguration and His humiliation (of the glorious beams and the bloody sweat).—The divine majesty with which the Lord comes out of His human sorrow.—The strength and solidity which the soul acquires from communion with Christ in all the conflicts of life and death.

Selections from other Homiletical Commentators.

I. THE WAY TO THE MOUNT OF OLIVES.—*Starke:*—From *Cramer:* He is a true friend who warns of danger; but flesh and blood is too secure, and will not take warning, 1 Thess. v. 3.—How easily may even the best men lapse into sin! James iii. 2.—*Osiander:* The cross and tribulation a great offence to the weak.—Professions: not to promise good is unbelief; to promise without earnest will is hypocrisy; to promise in reliance upon our own strength is presumption.—*Hedinger:* Good-will must guard carefully against arrogance.—Trust none less than thine own heart, Jer. xvii. 9.—*Canstein:* Nothing is so hidden from us as our own hearts.—We never come to know thoroughly our own weakness and unsteadiness.—The imagination which we have formed concerning ourselves prevents our seeing what we are and what we are not.—Hard work it is to wean a man away from his false imaginations about himself.—To contradict the voice of truth is the sum of shame.

Lisco:—The Searcher of hearts.—Peter trusts more the strength of his feeling than the word of Jesus.

Gerlach:—The Lord quotes the language of Scripture oftener in His sufferings than in any other circumstances. So in the temptation in the wilderness, ch. iv. 1-11.

Heubner:—This prediction of the Lord shows His supreme peace and victory over self.—The suffering Messiah was a riddle to them.—Christ is the only bond of His people: take Him away, and all is dissolved.—He would give them all a proof of His unlimited knowledge of men's hearts: that was of importance for their whole life.—The over-hasty, the presumptuous, and the self-confident, are those whom God suffers to fall.—There is a great difference between arrogance of flesh and alacrity of spirit.—The honest humility with which the disciples relate their own faults.—Warning to us all not to take offence at the Lord in anything.

II. GETHSEMANE:—*Starke:*—The transfiguration upon the high mountain; the humiliation in the deep valley.—It is not wise for every one to reveal everywhere and indiscriminately his heart and all its impulses, Gen. xxii. 5; for there are weak people, who cannot bear the strong.—*Osiander:* We can disburden ourselves most confidently in the ears of our God when we have no one, or but few, near us.—*Canstein:* Christ enters upon His passion with prayer; He carries it on and ends it with prayer; and so teaches us that our own sufferings cannot be overcome and made to subserve our salvation without much prayer.—The three Apostles called in Gal. ii. 9 pillars: Peter, the first who opened to Jews and Gentiles the door of the kingdom of heaven; James, the first martyr; John, the longest liver, to whom the most glorious revelations were vouchsafed.—The trials of Abraham, Paul, Luther (great saints, great trials).—*Canstein:* The faithful God ministers trials according to the measure of the ability of those who are to bear them (1 Cor. x. 13).—When it is time to fight and to pray, we ought not to sleep.—God lets His weak children for a long time see others in the conflict, before they themselves are exposed to the contest.—The cup of Christ's suffering has consecrated the cup of our cross.—Trust not to men, Ps. cxviii. 7.—Our best security against temptation is to watch and pray.—The daily contest of the spirit with the flesh absolutely necessary, Gal. v. 17.—Thy will be done.—We may pray for mitigation.—When Jesus is suffering in His members, our eyes are, alas! commonly full of sleep.—Perseverance in prayer without fainting, Luke xviii. 1.—A faithful father warns his children of danger.—He who feels safe in the time of danger may easily be ruined; he who is cautious and self-distrustful will escape.—When one *hour* of trial is passed, we must prepare for another.—When we in God's strength have overcome the first assaults and terrors of death, all is more and more tolerable, until the cross itself is gloriously triumphed over.—Jesus our Forerunner.—Christ went freely and joyfully to meet His passion, for an example to us, Phil. ii. 5.

Lisco:—Heb. v. 7. The threefold prayer reminds us of the threefold victory over Satan, when he tempted Jesus, ch. iv. 1.

Gerlach:—From *Luther:* "We men, born and bound in sin, have an impure, hard, and leprous skin, which does not soon feel. But, because Christ's body, His flesh and blood, is fresh, and pure, and sound, without sin, while ours are full of sin, we feel the terror of death in a far less degree from what He felt it." The disciples should *watch with Him*, and *they* should pray; but *with Him* they could not *pray;* in His mediatorial conflict no man could stand by and help Him.—He desired the fellowship of these as the first-fruits of the men who were to be redeemed by Him.—In this severe agony of the passion, the divine will ever more and more penetrates and exalts the human.

Heubner:—It was a garden, as in Gen. iii.—Not all the disciples were fitted to be witnesses of this profound and mysterious humiliation of our Lord.—*Rambach:* It is not expedient that the child of God should reveal to every one the depths of his heart.—It is the highest grace to be companion of the most secret sorrows of Jesus.—Jesus is the source of consolation and encouragement for all burdened and heavy-laden souls.—The greater the anguish, the greater the joy.—*Rieger:* And He went to a little distance. So the high-priest went into the Holiest.—The Son of God bows down to the uttermost before

His Father, to make us acceptable.—O that we better learned the lesson to bow down before God!—Jacob's wrestling in the night, Hos. xii. 4, 5.—Sleepiness and inconsiderateness among Christians, monitors of fall.—Christ awakens out of sleep.—The second petition takes for granted an answer of God, that His will was fixed on this (as indeed did the first); hence the more direct expression of resignation.—In prayer we do not depend upon many and beautifully arranged words; the heart is the great thing (as in the prayers of Moses, David, Daniel, and Christ).—The Holy One falls absolutely into the power of the unholy.—*Is at hand:* the betrayal, now brought to its consummation, troubled the soul of Jesus afresh.—There is a difference between the mere expectation, albeit certain, and the fulfilled reality.—*Kapff:* Jesus suffering in Gethsemane: 1. Its depth; 2. its cause; 3. its fruit.

FIFTH SECTION.

JESUS ON THE NIGHT OF HIS BETRAYAL: JESUS AND THE TRAITOR; JESUS AND THE DEFENDER; JESUS AND THE MULTITUDE; JESUS AND HIS DISCIPLES GENERALLY; OR THE GLORY OF JESUS IN THE NIGHTLY ASSAULT AND THE CONFUSION OF THE IMPRISONMENT.*

CHAPTER XXVI. 47–56.

(Mark xiv. 43–52; Luke xxii. 47–53; John xviii. 1–11.)

47 And while he yet spake [was yet speaking, ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος], lo, Judas, one of
the twelve, came, and with him a great multitude with swords and staves [clubs, ξύλων],[1]
48 from the chief priests and elders of the people. Now he that betrayed him gave them
a sign, saying, Whomsoever [Whom, ὅν] I shall kiss, that same is he; hold him fast.
49 And forthwith he came to Jesus, and said, Hail [χαῖρε], Master [Rabbi];[2] and kissed
50 him. And Jesus said unto him, Friend, wherefore art thou come? [*do that* for which
thou art here!][3] Then came they, and laid hands on Jesus, and took him [held him
51 fast, as in ver. 48]. And, behold, one of them which [that] were with Jesus stretched out
his hand, and drew his sword, and struck a [the] servant[4] of the high priest, and smote
52 off his ear. Then said Jesus unto him, Put up again thy sword into his place: for all
53 they that take the sword shall perish with the sword.[5] [Or, ἤ] Thinkest thou that I
cannot now pray to my Father, and he shall presently[6] give me [place beside me, παραστήσει μοι][7]
54 more than twelve legions of angels? But how then [How then, πῶς οὖν][8]
shall [can] the Scriptures be fulfilled, that thus it must be? [fulfilled? For thus it must
55 be.] In that same hour [in that hour, ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ] said Jesus to the multitudes, Are
ye come out as against a thief [robber, λῃστήν][9] with swords and staves [clubs] for[10] to
take me? I sat daily with you teaching in the temple, and ye laid no hold on me.
56 But all this was done, that the Scriptures of the prophets might be fulfilled. Then all
the disciples [the disciples all][11] forsook him, and fled.

* All these significant headings are omitted in the Edinb. trsl.—P. S.]

[1] Ver. 47.—[The Vulgate translates μετὰ μαχαιρῶν καὶ ξύλων: *cum gladiis et fustibus;* Lange: *mit Schwertern und mit Keulen;* other German Versions: *Stangen*, or *Knitteln*, or *Prügeln; staves* was introduced by Tyndale, and retained in the subsequent English Version, except that of Rheims, which renders ξύλα: *clubs.* *Staff* is the proper translation for ῥάβδους in ch. x. 10; Mark vi. 8; but the Authorized Version renders ξύλα and ῥάβδους alike. Comp. ver. 55; Luke xxii. 52. John mentions also *lanterns* and *torches*, to search perhaps in the secret parts of the garden and the dark caverns of the valley of the Kedron.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 49.—[The colder and more formal *Rabbi* ought be retained here and in ver. 25 in the translation, as Matthew retained it from the Hebrew for διδάσκαλε, and as the English Version itself did in ch. xxiii. 7, 8.—P. S.]

[3] Ver. 50.—[The words: ἐφ' ὃ πάρει, are generally understood as a question and so punctuated in most editions; but Fritzsche takes them as an exclamation: *For what* (dreadful deed) *art thou here!* Meyer, Ewald, Lange, as an elliptical command, as to say: Away with your hypocritical kiss; do rather that *for which thou art here!* See the *Exeg. Notes.* But the ellipsis might also be supplied by an οἶδα: I know *for what thou art here.*—P. S.]

[4] Ver. 51.—[Τὸν δοῦλον, the well known servant, viz., Malchus, John xviii. 10. Comp. Mark xiv. 47, where the English Version likewise substitutes the indefinite article.—P. S.]

[5] Ver. 52.—Some uncial Codd. read ἀποθανοῦνται [for ἀπολοῦνται].

[6] Ver. 53.—[*Presently* should be omitted, as it arose from confounding two readings in the text, some authorities placing ἄρτι, *now*, after παραστήσει, others after δύναμαι, but none repeating it. Cranmer's Bible first put *now* (even

now) after both verbs, while Tyndale, the Genevan Bible, and the Bishops' Bible have it only after *cannot*, and the Rheims N. T. (following the Vulgate) after *give me*. King James' revisers substituted *presently* for the second *now*.—P. S.]

[7] Ver. 53.—[Or: *cause to stand by*, as the Bishops' Bible literally renders παραστήσει, and Scrivener commends. Conant prefers "*send*" with Coverdale. Campbell: "*send to my relief*."—P. S.]

[8] Ver. 54.—[*But* is an insertion to make the connection plainer, or it was supposed to be implied in οὖν. But the meaning is: Considering then that God could place such a mighty force at My disposal, how is it possible, etc.—P. S.]

[9] Ver. 55.—[Not: κλέπτης, which is expressly distinguished from λῃστής in John x. 1, 8. Comp. Matt. xxi. 13, and note. Scrivener: "All these precautions would be futile against a petty thief, though very proper against a bandit, such as Barnabas for example."—P. S.]

[10] Ver. 55.—[*For* before the infinitive is obsolete and should be omitted in a revised translation.—P. S.]

[11] Ver. 56.—[This is the emphatic form of the Greek: οἱ μαθηταὶ πάντες, and so rendered by Conant and others.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 47. **Then came Judas.**—He knew the spot, as being the place where Jesus often met His disciples, John xviii. 2. During the completion of the meal, the final discourses of Jesus, and His agony in Gethsemane, Judas went out into the night, and consummated the work of his villany. His impetuosity induced the Sanhedrin to rescind their resolution of not taking Jesus at the feast. This it was first necessary that they should decide upon, and then summon the temple-guard; after which the permission of the Roman governor was to be obtained, and the requisite military protection. Judas had reckoned upon all this delay, and had calculated that time enough would be allowed for Jesus to have reached Gethsemane. But that the preparation which the high priests in league with Judas appointed, was exaggerated and excessive, all the Evangelists agree. According to John, Judas brought the Roman cohort (σπεῖρα). Even if we do not understand this literally—as the one Roman cohort which was stationed in the Castle Antonia consisted of 500 men—yet we may assume that the disposable portion of that force, representing the cohort, was there. To these must be added, according to Luke, the temple-watch. Such a watch belonged to the temple, and was commanded by a στρατηγός, Acts iv. 1. The plural στρατηγοί (Luke xxii. 52), refers to the presence of other and subordinate officers. The torches also betray the excess of the preparation; although even the paschal full moon would not render these needless, when searching among the shady caverns of the gloomy valley of the Kedron.

One of the twelve.—The significance of this expression here rests upon this, that Judas no longer comes in the train of the disciples as a follower of Jesus, but at the head of the hostile multitude.

With him a great multitude.—The **swords*** indicate that the Roman cohort (John xviii. 3) was the centre of this multitude: while the **clubs**, and so forth, indicate that the Jewish temple-watch, and other miscellaneous fanatics, were there also. According to Luke xxii. 52, there were also fanatical priests and elders who mingled in the procession,—a circumstance which Meyer refers to a later and incorrect enlargement of the tradition. But Luke appears to regard representatives of the Sanhedrin as requisite for such a religious capture as this was (*see* Acts iv. 1); and Meyer under-estimates the fanatical impulses of Jewish fanaticism.

With swords and clubs, from the high priests.—Here we see the mingled religious and political relations. The Sanhedrin had the decision in all matters of spiritual jurisdiction. Thus it was for them to settle the question whether any one was a false prophet, and therefore worthy of stoning,—the appointed punishment of that crime. That question they had already settled in the affirmative some time before, having determined to put Jesus to death (John xi. 47); although they found themselves wanting in grounds of action, which therefore they endeavored by cunning to obtain from Himself, but failed. The right of putting offenders to death had been taken from them by the Roman government (John xviii. 31); hence the Roman crucifixion was afterward substituted for the Jewish stoning. Thus their undertaking was, on the whole, a daring experiment of wickedness. They were as yet without false witnesses and without grounds of accusation; they had not the thorough consent of Pilate; and they must silence and win over, by some sudden stimulant, the common people. On this account they aimed to give the capture, in which the Roman soldiers were at their disposal, a spurious character of importance; their excessive preparation would have the effect of creating the presumption that Jesus must be a very great criminal.

Ver. 48. **Gave them a sign.**—Meyer: "The ἔδωκεν is commonly, but improperly, regarded as having a pluperfect sense. The Vulgate has it right, *dedit*. As he came he gave them a sign." [So also Alford].—**Whom I shall kiss.**—The kiss was among the ancients a sign of affectionate and cordial intimacy, and particularly a token of fidelity, Gen. xxix. 11. More commonly, the teachers kissed their pupils; but examples of the converse are not wanting. Lightfoot, *Horæ*, p. 484. It is doubtful whether the kiss of reverent submission (Ps. ii. 12) was impressed on the lips: probably on the hands or the feet.

Hold Him fast, seize Him.—We take the κρατήσατε αὐτόν as emphatic. Possibly there was a touch of irony in the language of the arch-traitor, who expected that Jesus might in a magical manner elude them after all. For the darkened mind of Judas had now come to regard Him as a magician.

Ver. 49. **And forthwith he came.**—Excited, but also dissembling. He pretended that he did not belong to the procession of enemies, that he would precede them, point out the danger, and separate from his Master with sorrow.—**Kissed Him.**—The κατεφίλησεν must be understood in all its emphasis, *to kiss very tenderly*, *to caress*. Comp. Xenoph. *Mem.* ii. 6, 33; Luke vii. 38, 45; Acts xx. 37. Meyer: "The sign was the simple kissing; but the performance was more emphatic, a caressing, corresponding with the purpose of Judas to make sure, and with the excitement of his feelings." The kiss of Joab, 2 Sam. xx. 9 (comp. 2 Sam. iii. 27). "The early Christians, who kissed each other at the Lord's Supper, did it as appropriate to the time when the sufferings of Christ were remembered; they did not thereby intend to express their abhorrence of Judas' kiss." Heubner.

* [Not: *these words*, as the Edinb. edition reads.—P. S.]

Ver. 50. **Friend,** *ἑταῖρε.*—Comp. ch. xx. 13 [and *Crit. Note* No. 4, p. 352.]

[Why did the Lord call Judas *friend*—a term of civility, though not necessarily of friendship—and not a *villain*, or a *traitor*, and why did He not turn away, in holy indignation, from this Judas-kiss, the vilest, the most abominable piece of hypocrisy known in history, which the infernal inspirer of treason alone could invent? To give us an example of the utmost meekness and gentleness under the greatest provocation, surpassing even the standard which He holds up for His disciples, Matt. v. 39. If the face of the Saviour was not disgraced by the traitor's kiss, no amount of injury and insult heaped upon His followers by the enemies of religion can really dishonor the former, but falls back with double effect upon the latter. At the same time the words *ἐφ' ὃ πάρει*, whether they be taken as a question, or as an exclamation, or as an elliptical assertion or command—together with the question recorded by Luke: "Betrayest thou the Son of Man with a kiss?" conveyed a most stinging rebuke to Judas, whose force was doubled by the use of the word *friend*, and the deep emotion and holy sadness with which they were uttered. The effect appears from the subsequent despair of Judas.—P. S.]

Do that for which thou art here!* [Authorized Version: **Wherefore art thou come?**—Meyer: "Since the relative *ὅς* (*ἐφ' ὃ πάρει*) is never used in direct question, but only in indirect, the common acceptation of this as a question is not correct; and it is quite groundless (Winer, 192) to assume a corruption in the declining Greek in relation to *ὅς*. Fritzsche explains it as an appeal *ad qualem rem perpetrandam ades!* But the Greek would require this also to take the form of a question. The words are broken off with an aposiopesis: Friend, that for which thou art here come—*do!* Jesus thereby denounces the traitorous kiss."—Ewald: "I need not thy kiss; I know that thou meanest it in hypocrisy; do rather that which is thy business." Similarly Euthym. Zigab. This would certainly accord with the declining of the kiss in Luke: Betrayest thou the Son of Man with a kiss? But, in this case, it is better to assume that it is a concise form only: *τοῦτο πρᾶττε, ἐφ' ὃ πάρει.* Or: *παρέστω, ἐφ' ὃ πάρει.* By the Lord's going out to meet the watch, the hypocritical play of Judas was interrupted. John alone relates the falling to the ground on the part of the multitude. But Jesus hastened to meet the multitude, in order to protect, not only the three, but also the other disciples on the outside of the garden.

Ver. 51. **And, behold, one of them.**—When the evangelical tradition first assumed shape and form, prudence required that the name of Peter should not be publicly mentioned. Hence the indefinite expression in the Synoptists. But this necessity did not exist when John wrote his Gospel: therefore he gives the name. The same remark applies to the omission of the raising of Lazarus in Bethany, which the Synoptists may have had good reasons for ignoring, but not John who wrote so much later.

Drew his sword.—When he saw that they laid hands on the Lord. According to Luke, the question was first asked from among the disciples, Lord, shall we smite with the sword? (On the two swords, compare Luke.) Immediately thereupon followed the blow of Peter's sword; and it struck the servant of the high priest, called Malchus, according to John. He had cut off his right ear: Matthew and Mark, *τὸ ὠτίον*; but Luke, *τὸ οὖς*, the ear itself, and not merely the lobe. It seemed that he would have split his head. The separation of the ear must have been not quite perfect; and Jesus healed the servant, according to the narrative of Luke the physician. Meyer, following Strauss, attributes this healing to a later tradition. The other Evangelists, however, appear to have regarded this healing as self-understood; as, otherwise, Peter would have remained a criminal, and the mutilation of Malchus would have furnished good ground of an accusation, which, however, was not preferred.

Ver. 52. **Put up again thy sword into its place.**—The sheath, John xviii. 11. Peter, therefore, still stood there with his drawn and brandished sword in his hand.—**For all they that take the sword.**—This is a judicial sentence, but also a threatening warning. In the former light, it rests upon an absolutely universal principle. The sword is visited by the sword in war; the sword of retribution opposes the arbitrary sword of rebellious sedition; and the sword taken up unspiritually in a spiritual cause, is avenged by the certain, though perhaps long-delayed, sword of historical vengeance. Peter was, in all these three aspects, in a bad position, and the representative of wrong. The warrior exposed himself to the superior force of the legions of Rome, the rebel to the order of the magistrate, and the abuse of the sword in the service of religion provoked, and seemed to justify, the same abuse on the part of the world. Peter had really forfeited his life to the sword; but the Lord rectified his wounded position by the correcting word which He spoke, by the miraculous healing of the ear, and by the voluntary surrender of Himself to the authorities. But Peter had not only with wilful folly entered on the domain of this world, he had also brought his Master's cause into suspicion. Indeed, he sought to bring his fellow-disciples, and his Lord Himself, into this wrong position, and to make his own Christ a Mohammed. Therefore the Lord so solemnly denounced his act, pronounced an ideal sentence of death upon his head, which, however, was graciously repealed. The Lord's word from that hour became a maxim of Christianity (comp. Rev. xiii. 10); and it was probably spoken to Peter with a typical significance. Even the Church of Rome says: *ecclesia non sitit sanguinem*, but only to have recourse to the stake and faggot, of which certainly the *letter* of this passage says nothing.

[**Shall perish.**—Alford: "*ἐν μαχαίρῃ ἀπολοῦνται* is a command; not merely a future, but an *imperative* future; a repetition by the Lord in this solemn moment of Gen. ix. 6. *See* the parallel in Rev. xiii. 10: *δεῖ αὐτὸν ἐν μαχ. ἀποκτανθῆναι.* This should be thought of by those well-meaning but shallow persons, who seek to abolish the punishment of death in Christian states." Comp. also Rom. xiii. 4. Thus the passage justifies capital punishment as a measure of just retribution for murder in the hands of the civil magistrate, but condemns at the same time the resort to all carnal and violent measures on the part of the Church, which is a spiritual body, and should only use spiritual weapons. Comp. 2 Cor. x. 3, 4. Rome agrees in theory (*Ecclesia non sitit sanguinem*), but violates it in practice by handing the heretics, wherever she has the power, to the state for execution, and thus using the civil magistrate as an instrument. *Quod quis per alium facit, id ipse fecisse dicitur.*—P. S.]

* [So Lange: "*Freund! (nur das) wozu du da bist!* Similarly Ewald: "*Freund, das wozu du da bist!* But Luther, de Wette, and other German Versions, agree with the English in taking the phrase as a question.—P. S.]

Ver. 53. **Or thinkest thou?**—If Christ had refused to take the way of the passion, He might have adopted quite another way than that of wilful and violent opposition to the world: the way, namely, of coming to judgment upon it. Thinkest thou not that, if I did not desire to be a long-suffering Redeemer, I might at once appear to the whole world as its supreme Judge, rather than enter upon thy hypocritical way of half-spirituality and half-worldliness, half-patience and half-violence, of civilization with a sword in its hand? For, the twelve legions of angels which He might have prayed for, doubtless signified that multitude of angels which will actually attend Him when He returns to judgment (ch. xxv. 31). If the Church of the Middle Ages had not the courage to achieve the evangelization of the world in the way of Christ's passion, she should have had faith to supplicate for the last day to come; but she did wrong to make Christ another Mohammed, and to continue His work by a hypocritical mixture of religious preaching and carnal violence. Meyer: "The number twelve corresponds to the number of the Apostles, because it was one of those who had just endeavored to defend Him." But it is also and always the number of the developed perfection of life. The legion is the symbol of a great fighting host. SCHAAF, *Alterthumskunde*: "By *legio* (*a legendo*) was originally understood the aggregate of the Roman military collected for war. When that force increased, it became a great division of the host, which contained, at various times, from 2400 to beyond 6000 infantry, and from 300 to 400 horsemen. Since the time of Marius, the legion had reached more than 6000."—It is well worthy of notice that Christ here numbers the angels by legions, as the counterpart of the Roman power, now leagued against Him with His enemies.

Ver. 54. **How then shall the Scriptures be fulfilled? for,** etc.—Meyer: "We must not supply λέγουσαι before ὅτι (Beza, Maldonatus, and others); but there must be a question after γραφαί, and ὅτι is *for*. *For thus* (in no other way) *must* it (that which now befalls Me) *be*." Thus there are two reasons: 1. The fulfilment of the Scripture concerning the suffering Messiah: Ps. xxii.; Isa. liii.; Dan. ix. 26; Zech. xiii. 7. 2. The counsel of God Himself for the salvation of a sinful world, which is the foundation of all the prophetical Scriptures.

Ver. 55. **In that hour said Jesus to the multitudes.**—According to Luke, especially to the rulers and the guard of the temple, which Meyer vainly seeks to set aside.—Starke: "Jesus did not say this before he had been seized and bound. He would give no indication that He was not willing to be taken; and therefore not till after they had done their will did He rebuke their injustice."—**In the temple**;—that is, in the forecourt of the temple. In this space the Rabbins placed a synagogue (comp. Luke ii. 46). Here also was to be sought Solomon's porch (John x. 23; Acts iii. 11), with other halls—the region of teaching and preaching.—**And ye laid no hold on Me.**—Certainly, because they durst not; but that exhibits their surprise by night as the work of evil conscience and malignity.

Ver. 56. **But all this is done that the Scriptures of the prophets might be fulfilled.**—Luke: "But this is your hour, and the power of darkness." The one supplements the other. Of this hour of darkness, and of the seeming triumph of evil, all the prophets prophesied: Isa. liii.; Dan. ix. 26, etc. The supposition of Erasmus, de Wette, and others, that this last word in Matthew was a remark of the Evangelist, takes off the point of our Lord's address, as Meyer rightly observes. It was this last word which indicated His settled purpose to take the path of death. Hence it also gave occasion for the flight of the disciples. Their courage now failed them, and they fled. The flight, however, was not absolute, as appears from the narrative of the young man in Mark xiv. 51, and the conduct of Peter and John, according to John xviii. 15. They followed Him, but afar off. In reality, the scattering and flight was complete. [But while the eleven forsook the Lord, other disciples, as Nicodemus, and Joseph of Arimathea, took a more decided stand for Him. The Church can never fail; new Christians always take the place of the old ones. Comp. Lange's notes on Mark xiv. 51, 52.—P. S.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *The Kiss of Judas.*—Its dark history in the world and the Church. This combination, the betrayal and the kiss of respect in one, could have been invented by no man, least of all by the soul of an Evangelist. He only who executed it could have devised it; or, rather, hell alone.

2. This wild combination of enemies—soldiers, temple-servants, and priests—for the accomplishment of an act of hypocritical violence against Christ, is also a typical world-historical scene.* Not less so is the surprise and capture of the Holy One in His Holiest of All, under the pretext of serving the sanctuary.

3. Peter showed by his first stroke that he was no soldier; happily he had missed his blow. That it was the ear of Malchus which he struck, is very significant. It has always been the ear, the spiritual hearing, and willing susceptibility, which carnal defenders of Christ's cause have taken away from their opponents, when they have had recourse to the sword of violence.

4. *They who take the Sword shall perish by the Sword.*—That this was said to Peter, had its typical historical meaning. "The early Christians, amidst all the slanders heaped upon them, were never charged with having risen in insurrection against their Gentile oppressors. Comp. Tertull. *Apol.* cap. 37. Luther (in the peasant insurrection) quoted this passage against the peasants. Duels also are by this sentence absolutely forbidden. The punishment of death for certain offences is clearly enjoined. *See* Rothe's *Ethik*, iii. 877." Heubner. How far a Christian state may be justified in giving this punishment another form, may be matter of reasonable question. In its essential significance the death penalty is an inalienable legal ordinance, but the form of social death and its execution has been in many ways subject to modification.

5. *Thinkest thou that I cannot.*—Christ rejects once for all that unholy and disturbing mixture of judgment and salvation into which carnal zeal is so much disposed to turn His cause. What He here says applies to every moment in the history of Christianity. If it were God's will that at any time (before the end) the economy of grace, effectual through the sacred cross, should be suspended, at that moment

* [Not: *symbolical*, as the Edinb. trsl. reads. In German: *ein typisches welthistorisches Bild*, *i. e.*, an event of typical significance which is frequently repeated and fulfilled in history.—P. S.]

the infinite preponderance of heavenly forces over the violence of the enemy of earth would at once be exhibited. But then the work of salvation would be broken off before its consummation. This no man should ever think of. Whenever men act on this principle, they tempt God, and summon such powers against the cause of evil as prove themselves to be, not angels of light, but disguised powers of darkness; and the enmity which these exhibit against the cause of evil is only apparent. Of such carnal violence against conscience we must distinguish educational legal discipline within the Church, as we must distinguish also between theocracy and hierarchy.

6. The assurance of Christ to those who came against Him with weapons in the night,—that He had been ready to give them an account in broad day,—has also a symbolical meaning for all ages. The persecutions of the faithful are always stamped with the mark of calumny.

7. The last word of Christ is the expression of His consummate preparation for His passion. Therefore it is the crisis when the disciples, not yet mature in faith, forsook Him. Old Testament martyrdom had in it some affinity with the self-sacrifice of a hero in battle: they hoped for the speedy triumph of the theocracy. The New Testament martyr must, in the patience of the saints (Rev. xiii. 10; xiv. 12), tarry for the manifestation of victory until the last day. For this the disciples were not ripe: they had not the joyful testimony of victory within their own spirits. This New Testament martyrdom could flourish only after the blood of Christ was shed.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The betrayal.—The first betrayal as the germ of the second.—Jesus and His company in the hour of betrayal.—An old and always new event, and yet an event standing alone.—No place upon earth is a perfectly secure refuge for the Church: God alone is that. (Luther sung: "A tower of strength our *God* is still," but many sing: "A tower of strength our *Church* is still.")*—Gethsemane: 1. Consecrated by Christ's prayer; 2. desecrated by the betrayal; 3. for ever consecrated by the voluntary resignation of Jesus.—The temple dishonored in the name of the temple.—Judas, having left the company of the Twelve, now at the head of Christ's enemies: a fearful image of a deep apostasy.—The sign of treachery, the self-condemnation of the traitor: 1. As the hypocritical sign of his acquaintance, of his discipleship, of his apostolical vocation; 2. as the token of his apostasy, of his ingratitude, of his reprobation.—The kiss of Judas, the most cunning and the maddest imagination of hell.—The serpent's bite in its historical consummation and spiritual meaning: 1. Consummated in the connection of hellish betrayal with the sign of heavenly honor (Ps. ii 12); 2. the sign of all treason against all faith and fidelity, taken from the sign of love and confidence.—Supreme cunning, one with supreme infatuation (stupidity).—*Friend, wherefore art thou here;* or, the counter-greeting of Christ to the traitor: 1. Infinitely gentle (although "*friend*" in Greek was no more than "companion"):* a mild allusion to his ingratitude. 2. Infinitely earnest and severe: Take the mask away! Stand forth as thou art! 3. Infinitely effectual: the subsequent despair of Judas.—How different, although related, the kiss of Judas and the sword-stroke of Peter!—The unholy use of the sword, and all the acts of spiritual violence do but dull the spiritual ear in their false zeal.—Christ between His friends and His enemies: oppressed by both, righteous to both.—The decree of the Lord, "All who take the sword," etc.: 1. A decisive action (the perfect action of perfect suffering); 2. a sacred principle; 3. a prediction scarcely half-fulfilled.—The connection between Peter's smiting with the sword and his denial: 1. Presumption, despondency; 2. wounded conscience, anxiety (John xviii. 26, Malchus' relation); 3. his misinterpretation of the word: "He that taketh the sword shall perish by the sword;" as if it were to be at once literally fulfilled.—Christ enters upon the path of His passion in the full consciousness of His heavenly glory (*Thinkest thou that I could not?*)—Not weakness restrains the judgment upon the wicked, but only the divine compassion.—One of the deadliest evils to Christ's cause is the intermixture of gospel and judgment in carnal zeal for the advantage of the Church: it makes both the gospel mercy and the judicial severity matter of contempt and scorn.—The protest of the Lord against the cunning violence of the assault, an eternal protest of the spirit of truth.—The cunning violence of the enemies of the truth condemns itself: 1. The violence and force condemns the cunning; 2. the cunning condemns the force.—Swords and staves mixed, and both lost: the honor of the sword, of the State; the dignity of the staff, of the Church.—The Scriptures of the prophets concerning Christ taken and bound.—Christ's peace in the great word that the dark hour of uttermost darkness was perfectly in accordance with the word and will of God.—The flight of the disciples at the end of their human enthusiasm was their guilt, and yet mercifully they were delivered from its consequences by their Lord's protection.—Christ the great Martyr, the Founder of New Testament martyrdom.

Starke:—Wickedness is often stupid and shameless. The wicked † are bold, Matt. vii. 22.—*Zeisius:* The Lord abhors the bloody and deceitful man, Ps. v. 6.—Ps. ii. 12, the kiss of genuine homage and love.—*Quesnel:* The world is full of deceitful courtesies and flatteries.—Everywhere we should be able to answer the question: Wherefore art thou come?—*Osiander:* When Christians are bound and put in prison without any guilt of their own, they should reckon it no disgrace, but rather the highest honor.—Even among the saints is much lust of revenge, Rom. xii. 19.—Provocation to anger and vengeance the most deadly temptations of Satan in the time of external tribulation.—Young and rash preachers are too apt to brandish Peter's sword, before they have learned to use the sword of the Spirit.—But when our carnal zeal smites wrongly, the injury is done to the ear, which should hear the word of God.—*Canstein:* God rules the sins and infirmities of His people in such a way, that they cannot do more evil than He has decreed to permit, Rom. xiii. 4.—*Luther:* They take the sword who use it without orderly authority. They have fallen under the judgment of

* [Dr. Lange alludes, of course, to the famous hymn of Luther: *Ein feste Burg ist unser Gott* (based upon Ps. xlvi. and composed 1529), which may be called the spiritual war-song of the Reformation, and which has been very often translated into English, by Thomas Carlyle, Mills, Cath. Winkworth, Bunting, and others. It is omitted in the Edinb. edition, together with a number of homiletical hints in this section.—P. S.]

* [Comp. note 4 on p. 852.—P. S.]

† [The Edinb. edition has *godly*,—no doubt a typographical error for *godless*.—P. S.]

the sword, although repentance may prevent the execution of the decree. Thus Christ approves a right use of the sword.—*Rambach:* Peter says (1 Ep. iv. 15): "Let no man suffer as a murderer or as an evil-doer," probably with allusion to this very event. If he had cut off the servant's head, he would have fallen under the condemnation of the law as a murderer, and then could never have died as a martyr.—1 Pet. ii. 13: No man must oppose lawful authority.—*Hedinger:* Christ's kingdom needs no sword; suffering and praying are the best weapons.—*Cramer:* The seditious go never unpunished, 2 Kings ix. 31; 2 Sam. xviii. 14.—The angels of Dan. vii. 10; Heb. i. 14.—That all the angels of God serve the Saviour, a great consolation for God's children.—*Canstein:* When God suffers His people to be overcome in external trouble, that is no sign of His weakness, but that these sufferings are decreed for His own glory and His people's good.—*Nova Bibl. Tub.:* The weapons of the false Church are swords and staves, external violence.—True Christians never shun the light: their words and deeds are manifest.—The heart, Jer. xvii. 9, 10, with reference to Peter.

Braune:—Jesus' suffering His greatest deed.—*Gerlach:* The sword out of its sheath is not in its place, except when it is subserving the wrath of God.

Lisco:—The sad fall of Judas should be a warning to every one not to indulge a vain reliance in the mere external fellowship of Christ.

Heubner:—The frightful transformation of Judas.—Judas at their head.—A studied dishonor to the Lord,—that they should come with so great a multitude.—Jesus, taken and suffering in the night, atones for the sins which are done in the night.—There is always a Judas-kiss among us (insincerity of profession, in office, in sacramental pledges, in the holy communion).—Jesus endures still the kiss of many false members of His Church.—Jesus, according to Luke xxii. 48, names his name: *Judah!* Thou art named *confessor*, and art become a *traitor*.—This Bound One is the Captain of God's host, the Leader of all mankind.—Jesus is free even in His bonds.—Peter not yet free from revenge and ambition.—How often must the Lord repair what the rashness and folly of His disciples have done amiss!—He who has full faith in God, his Father, sees himself without amazement surrounded by enemies; invisible defenders are around him, and the Almighty is his help.—Look on all sufferings as the Lord's good pleasure; so will all their bitterness be gone.—Wrong for ever shuns the light.—Goodness can always appeal to its open, frank, and known behavior before the world.—The forsaken Jesus is the atonement of our unfaithfulness.—He knows what the forsaken feel.

Kapff:—What we may learn from Jesus when taken captive: 1. Courage and strength; 2. humility and submission to the will of God; 3. meekness and love for our enemies.—*Brandt:* Because Adam would not be bound by God's commandment and his own obedience, Christ must be bound by human bonds.—*Grammlich:* Christ's fettered hands tear away the bonds of our death.

[BURKITT:—None sin with so much impudence and obstinacy, as apostates.—There is so much hypocrisy in many, and so much corruption in all, that we must not be too confident. Peter's heart was sincere, but his head rash in drawing the sword.—God's intentions are no warrant for irregular actions.—Christ will thank no man to fight for Him without a warrant and commission from Him.—Christ was more concerned for our salvation than for His own temporal preservation.—Had He been rescued by the power of angels, we would have fallen into the paw of devils. MATTHEW HENRY:—Many betray Christ with a *kiss*, and *Hail, Master*, who, under pretence of doing Him honor, betray and undermine the interests of His kingdom.—*Mel in ore, fel in corde*—Honey in the mouth, gall in the heart.—Καταφιλεῖν οὐκ ἐστιφιλεῖν—To embrace is one thing, to love another.—Jacob's kiss and Judas's kiss were much alike.—*Religio cogi non potest, et defendenda non occidendo, sed moriendo.* [From Lactantius: *Institutiones div.* Similar remarks might be quoted from Tertullian's *Apologeticus*, and other ante-Nicene writers, who opposed religious persecution and claimed toleration as an inalienable right of conscience.—P. S.] Men hasten and increase their own troubles by blustering, bloody methods of self-defence.—Persecutors are paid in their own coin, Rev. xiii. 10.—God has no need of us, of our services, much less of our sins, to bring about His purposes; and it argues our distrust and disbelief of the power of Christ, when we go out of the way of our duty to serve His interests.—There is an innumerable company of angels, Heb. xii. 22. (Twelve legions = above seventy-two thousand, and yet a mere detachment which would not be missed in heaven.)—Let God's word be fulfilled and His will be done, whatever may become of us.—The Scriptures are fulfilling every day.—What folly, to flee, for fear of death, from Him who is the fountain of life! Lord, what is man!—Christ, as the Saviour of souls, stood alone; as He needed not, so He had not the assistance of any other. *He trod the wine-press alone*, and when there was *none to uphold*, then *His own arm wrought salvation*, Isa. lxiii. 3, 5.—P. S.]

SIXTH SECTION.

CHRIST BEFORE CAIAPHAS.

CHAPTER XXVI. 57-68.

(Mark xiv. 53-65; Luke xxii. 54-71; John xviii. 12-24.)

57 And they that had laid hold on Jesus led *him* away to Caiaphas the high priest,
58 where the scribes and the elders were assembled. But Peter followed him afar off
unto the high priest's palace [the court of the high priest],[1] and went in, and sat with

59 the servants, to see the end. Now the chief priests and [the] elders,[2] and all the council, sought false witness against Jesus, to [that they might, ὅπως] put him to death;
60 But [And, καί] found none: yea, though many false witnesses came, *yet* found they
61 none.[3] At the last [But at last, ὕστερον δέ] came two false witnesses, And said, This *fellow* [man][4] said, I am able to destroy the temple of God, and to build it in [within]
62 three days. And the high priest arose, and said unto him, Answerest thou nothing? what *is it which* these witness against thee? [what do these witness against thee?]
63 But Jesus held his peace [was silent].[5] And the high priest answered [spoke to the meaning of His silence][6] and said unto him, I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us
64 whether thou be [art] the Christ, the Son of God. Jesus saith unto him, Thou hast said [it]: nevertheless [besides, πλήν] I say unto you, Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in [on] the clouds of heaven.
65 (Dan. vii. 13.) Then the high priest rent his clothes, saying, He hath spoken blasphemy; what further need have we of witnesses? behold, now ye have [ye have now]
66 heard his blasphemy. What think ye? They answered and said, He is guilty
67 [worthy, ἔνοχος][7] of death. Then did they spit [they spit] in his face, and buffeted
68 him; and others smote *him* with the palms of their hands,[8] Saying, Prophesy unto us, thou Christ, Who is he that smote thee?

[1] Ver. 58.—[Comp. Crit. Note 8 on ch. xxvi. 3, p. 459, on the true meaning of αὐλή.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 59.—B., D., L., al., [also Cod. Sinait.], omit καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι. Probably an unnecessary insertion from ver. 57. [Lachmann and Alford omit it, but Tischendorf retains, and Meyer defends it.—P. S.]

[3] Ver. 60.—The second οὐχ εὗρον is omitted in B., C., and Origen. Comp. Meyer on the probability of an insertion and the manner of its origin. [The *text. rec.*, which is supported by the majority of MSS., reads: καὶ πολλῶν ψευδομαρτύρων προσελθόντων, οὐχ εὗρον, but Griesbach and the critical editors omit καί before πολλῶν, and οὐχ εὗρον, or at least the last two words, on the authority of three Alexandrine uncials (B., C., L.), to which must now be added also Cod. Sinait., and the Vulgate (*cum multi falsi testes accessissent*) and later versions. Dr. Conant, following this reading, renders: *though many false witnesses came.* Lachmann, however, while he omits καί, retains οὐχ εὗρον in brackets. So Lange in his German Version. The case is hardly clear and important enough to justify us to disturb the Authorized English Version.—P. S.]

[4] Ver. 61.—[In the original simply οὗτος, which the English Version generally renders: *this;* in some cases: *this man. Fellow* is too disrespectful in modern English, especially if applied to Christ, and should be omitted here, ver. 71, and xii. 24.—P. S.]

[5] Ver. 63.—[Lange, and all the German Versions: *Schwieg stille.* This is all the Greek ἐσιώπα expresses, while *to hold one's peace* seems to imply the suppression of feeling or emotion. Silence is often better than speech, and in this case was the best answer.—P. S.]

[6] Ver. 63.—B., C., and other MSS., and some translations (*Vulgata*) omit the ἀποκριθείς, probably on account of the difficulty of its meaning in its connection with the previous silence.

[7] Ver. 66.—[Or: "*worthy to die*," Tyndale, Cranmer, Cheke, Genevan, Bishops'; or: "*he deserves to die*," Campbell; or: "*he is deserving of death*," Scrivener. The rendering of ἔνοχος θανάτου in the Authorized Version is borrowed from Wiclif, Coverdale, and the Rhemish N. T., and retained by Conant and the revised Version of the Am. Bible Union, but it is hardly justifiable now after the old Saxon sense of *guilt* (= *debt*) has become obsolete. In the same antiquated sense *guilty* is used Mark xiv. 64; 1 Cor. xi. 27.—P. S.]

[8] Ver. 67.—[The words: *with the palms of their hands*, should be omitted as not necessarily implied in ἐρράπισαν, which means to strike with a *stick* as well as with the hand. Hesychius derives ῥαπίζειν from ῥάβδος. The margin of the Authorized Version reads: *Or, rods*, following the Genevan Version and Beza ("*le frappait de leur verges*)." So also Bengel, Meyer, Ewald, and Lange. This is preferable here, since οἱ δέ, *and others*, introduces a new kind of abuse differing from *buffeting*, and since Mark (xiv. 65) ascribes the ῥαπίζειν to the *servants*. But the word is better left indefinite. Older English Versions add: *on the face.* So Lange: *schlugen ihm in's Angesicht. See Exeg. Notes.*—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Chronological Order of Events.—1. The preparatory examination by Annas, John xviii. 13; 2. the examination during the night before Caiaphas; 3. the formal and final examination before Caiaphas and the Sanhedrin on Friday morning (Matt., Mark, Luke). This threefold examination by the ecclesiastical tribunal was followed by another threefold examination on the part of the secular authorities,—first, by Pilate; then by Herod (Luke); and, lastly, a second time by Pilate. Between these examinations the following events intervened:—1. The mocking and buffeting on the part of the servants of the temple, between the second and the third examination by the ecclesiastical authorities. 2. The being set at nought after the second examination by the secular rulers, or before Herod; the white robe. 3. The setting at nought and buffeting after His third examination; the scarlet robe.—Matthew and the other two Evangelists pass over the examination of the Lord by Annas. It is, however, related with all its particulars by John; and, indeed, was quite in accordance with the views of the Jews. Though Annas had been deposed, the Jews seem still to have considered him as their real high-priest; while, at the same time, they were obliged in an official capacity to acknowledge Caiaphas, whom the Romans had appointed "that same year." As Caiaphas was the son-in-law of Annas, they would, in all probability, order their domestic arrangements so as to meet the views of the Jews without giving offence to the Romans. Accordingly, we would suggest that both lived in one and the same palace; which would also account for the fact, that while the examination was successively carried on in two different places, the guard seems to have remained in the same inner court of the palace. This is ev-

ident from a comparison of the narrative of Peter's denial as given by John, in its relation to that of the same event as recorded by the other Evangelists. Similarly, this would also explain the fact, that in the three first Gospels we only read of Christ being led before Caiaphas. From the peculiar practical view taken by Matthew, we can readily understand why he should have only recorded the official examination. In general, we infer that the examination by Annas was mainly an attempt on the part of the old priest (whom Klopstock, without adequate grounds, represents in a milder light) to ensnare the Lord in His words, and thus to elicit some tenable grounds of accusation. The examination by Caiaphas was merely a formal matter. The only importance attaching to it is, that the testimony of Christ, to the effect that He was the Christ, the Son of God, was there declared to be blasphemy, and deserving of death. The circumstances as now detailed will enable us to understand how Matthew and Mark relate first the examination by the high-priest, and then the denial by Peter, while this order is reversed in the Gospel by Luke. Evidently the threefold denial on the part of Peter extended from the first to the second examination of the Master.

Ver. 57. **Where the scribes and the elders were assembled.**—In accordance with our former remarks, we conclude that this was a preliminary meeting of the Sanhedrin, quite distinct from the regular and formal meeting which took place early on the following morning. It is quite characteristic of the Evangelists, that John details the first examination, Luke the third, while Matthew and Mark record the second. John evidently apprehended the rejection of Christ by the Jews as originating in the hatred of Annas and the priests, which decided the rest of the procedure; Luke viewed it in the light of its political bearing; the other two Evangelists described it in its relation to the central idea of the hierarchy as this unfolded itself to their intuitions.

Ver. 58. **Afar off.**—As it were, not with the cordial closeness of a disciple, but like a mere spectator or observer.

Unto the court or hall.—Not the *palace*, as in Luther [and in our authorized version]. The expression αὐλή was applied, among the Greeks, both to the hall or court in front of the house, and to the dwelling itself. In Eastern and Jewish houses it was the inner court surrounded by side halls.* Here the hall of the palace, the court-yard. According to the account given by John, He had obtained immediate access into the inner hall, and then procured admission for Peter. Tradition asserts that John had become acquainted with the family of the high-priest while still engaged in his original calling as fisherman. "As in all eastern houses, so in this palace, the windows of the room or the openings of the hall in which Jesus was examined, would open into the inner court, which, according to Mark xiv. 66, must have been somewhat lower than the rest of the house. There Peter, and perhaps John also, heard part of the examination that went on. Accordingly, the accounts in the three first Gospels bear evident marks of having been derived from eye-witnesses, who, however, had not heard all that had passed. But the account given by John was manifestly supplemented from more full and satisfactory reports." Gerlach.

Ver. 59. **And all the council.**—So Matthew adds from his ideal theocratic point of view. The expression must evidently be taken in a general sense. In their official capacity as a *council*, the whole assemblage were animated by the same spirit of hatred and murder. Individual exceptions, such as Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathea, are left out of view by the historian. Besides, they may not have been present at this meeting. It will be remembered, that when, on a much earlier occasion, Nicodemus attempted to speak in favor of Jesus, he was threatened with excommunication, John vii. 50, etc. Again, according to John ix. 22, the council had formerly passed a resolution to excommunicate any person who should own Jesus as the Christ. Hence it seems probable that Nicodemus had taken no further part in the deliberations of the council against Jesus. Similarly, we conceive that Joseph of Arimathea had also, on an earlier occasion, spoken in the same spirit as Nicodemus, Luke xxiii. 51. Other members of the Sanhedrin may have been frightened and kept away in like manner by the threat of excommunication. From Luke xxii. 70 we infer that these members of the council were not present even at the formal and official examination which took place in the morning. Finally, it deserves notice that the procedure of the Sanhedrin against Jesus may be said to have extended, from first to last, throughout the whole of His official career. This appears most clearly from the account furnished in the Gospel of John. Ch. ii. 18: first attendance at the Passover in the year 781; comp. ch. iv. 1; v. 16: festival of Purim, 782. Commencement of the persecutions in Galilee.—Ch. vii. 1; ix. 14: feast of Tabernacles, in the year 782. Excommunication pronounced upon the adherents of Jesus, ch. ix. 22. Open and full persecutions in Galilee.—John x. 22: feast of the Dedication of the Temple, in the winter of the year 782. Ch. x. 31: attempt to stone Jesus. Ch. xi. 57: pronouncing of the ban or injunction, that any one who knew where Jesus was, should immediately indicate the same to the council.—Ch. xii. 10: the decisive meeting of the council on the evening before Christ's entry into Jerusalem, when the resolution was also taken to kill Lazarus. Then followed the three examinations during the night of the betrayal, when it was no longer a matter of question whether Jesus should be put to death,—the main object only being to observe some kind of legal form, and to fix upon a sufficient ground of accusation. Of course, Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathea could not be present on these occasions.

Sought false witness against Jesus.—Meyer: "Ψευδομαρτυρίαν, *i. e.*, as viewed by the historian." But it ought to be kept in mind that the priests acted not merely under the impulse of fanaticism, but with a fixed determination to find proof against Christ, whether it were rightly or wrongly obtained. The remark of de Wette, that they would have preferred to have found true witness, and did not purposely seek for false, seems somewhat superfluous, as this would of course be the case. It is sufficient, that they were fully conscious that true witness could not be obtained.

Ver. 60. **But found none.**—According to Mark xiv. 56, "their witness agreed not together." By the law of Moses, at least two witnesses were required to agree if the accusation was to be sustained (Num.

* [The entrance to this enclosed area, or court-yard, was through the porch, πυλῶν, ver. 71, or προαύλιον, Mark xiv. 68. Comp. Crit. Note on ver. 3, p. 450.—P. S.]

xxxv. 30 Deut. xvii. 6; xix. 15). Hence in the following clause the emphasis rests on the word *two*. At last the smallest requisite number was found!

Ver. 61. **This man said.**—A perversion of the statement of Jesus in John ii. 19 (λύσατε), which had referred to His body. "Misunderstood and altered," observes Meyer; "but whether intentionally or not, cannot be decided." But a witness is fully responsible, if not for his understanding of the words which he reports, yet for the accuracy of his quotation. A witness from hearsay, who professes to have himself heard a certain statement, or an accuser who has not accurately heard what he reports, must also be regarded as a false witness.

Within three days, διά, not *after* three days.—From this passage, as well as from the treatment of Stephen (Acts vi. 13), we learn that statements derogatory to the temple were treated as blasphemy. Nor is it difficult to infer the reason of this—the temple being regarded as the symbol of the Jewish religion. Jesus held his peace, "in lofty self-consciousness," not merely because the witness was false, but also because, even if true, it was really no evidence of hostility to the temple, since, along with the statement of its destruction, it had held out the promise of its restoration; and because the whole of this preliminary questioning pointed forward to His avowal of His Messianic character, to which, after all, the inquiry must ultimately come.

Ver. 62. **And the high-priest arose.**—"The chief-priest loses his self-possession, and rises up." Perhaps more accurately it may be characterized as a piece of theatrical affectation, the high-priest pretending to be filled with holy indignation.—**Answerest Thou nothing?**—Meyer: The arrangement of the following clause into two distinct queries is exceedingly characteristic of passionate hatred, and quite warranted by the phraseology, as ἀποκρίνεσθαί τι may mean *to answer something*, and τί may be equivalent to ὅ, τι.

Ver. 63. **And the high-priest answered.**—He understood the meaning of Christ's silence, and hence answered His silent *speech*. Meyer rightly observes: "He replied to the continuous silence of Jesus by formally proposing to Him to answer on oath the question, whether He was the Messiah. On this everything depended, in order to secure that the sentence of death pronounced against Him should be confirmed by the Roman authorities." Comp. John xviii. 19.

I adjure Thee.—Gen. xxiv. 3; 2 Chron. xxxvi. 13. When such a formula of adjuration was employed, a simple affirmation or negation was regarded in law as sufficient to constitute a regular oath. *See* Michaelis, *Laws of Moses*, § 302. Grotius: *ἐξορκίζειν, Hebraice* השביע, *modo est jurejurando adigere, interdum vero obsecrare. Solebant judices talem ὁρκισμόν adhibere, ut aut testibus testimonium aut reis confessionem exprimerent.* Another formula of the same kind is mentioned in John ix. 24. "The judge adjured the witness, who, by a simple *Yea* and *Amen*, made the oath his own."

By the living God.—Not in the sense of "pointing Thee" to Him, but in that of putting the oath as in His presence, and in view of Him as the judge and avenger. The living God Himself was invoked as the witness and the judge of any untruth, Heb. vi. 13; x. 31.—**Thou hast said,** εἶπας.—An affirmation (ver. 25), and consequently an oath. The conduct of Christ is not inconsistent with ch. v. 34, since in the present instance the Lord was placed before the constituted authorities of the land, and acted as bound in law. "*Rationalists* have understood the words of Jesus as implying: Thou sayest it, not I!" "He tells them now that He is the Christ." Braune.

The Son of God.—More fully reported in Luke xxii. 67, and ver. 70. From that passage it appears that the expression, Son of God, was not merely intended as a further addition to the term *Christ* (de Wette), but meant to express the Christian idea attaching to the latter designation.

Ver. 64. **Besides,** πλήν.—A particle of transition, intended to introduce a new statement, Luke xix. 27. "Not *profecto* (Olshausen), nor *quin* (Kuinoel), [nor *nevertheless*, as in the authorized Engl. version], but, *besides*, or over, beyond My affirmation of this adjuration." Meyer.* Besides this, I shall henceforth manifest Myself as the Messiah over you; My Messianic glory shall appear before your eyes. Thus, of His own accord did Jesus now add His royal testimony to the confession which He had been forced to make.—**From hence shall ye see.**—The expression must not be limited to the final appearing of Christ, but refers to His whole state of *exaltation*,—to that personal exaltation which reveals itself in the almighty power and universal influence exercised by Him throughout the course of history. —**Sitting on the right hand of power.**—Τῆς δυνάμεως = הַגְּבוּרָה (Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.*, p. 3855). *Power*, one of the main attributes of the Deity, here the abstract for the concrete, to indicate how, under this influence, His apparent impotence would at once be transformed into omnipotence. According to Ps. cx. 1, "sitting at the right hand" refers to the exaltation of the Messiah, and to the manifestation of His δόξα; more especially to His share in the government of the world, in the form of festive rest and absolute supremacy.—**And coming in the clouds of heaven.**—The expression does not merely refer to His final advent (de Wette), but to the whole judicial administration of Christ, which commenced immediately after His resurrection, but especially at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, and shall be completed in the end of the world.

Ver. 65. **Then the high-priest rent his clothes.**—"He rent his *Simla*, or upper garment (not his high-priestly robe, which he only wore in the temple; comp. Reland, *Antiq.* ii. c. 1, § 11). A mark of indignation, Acts xiv. 14; on other occasions, of mourning (2 Sam. i. 11); and in this sense interdicted to the high-priest (Lev. x. 6; xxi. 10), but only on ordinary occasions. This prohibition, however, does not seem to have applied to extraordinary occurrences: 1 Macc. ii. 14; Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 15, iv." De Wette. The practice of rending the clothes on occasions of supposed blasphemy was based on 2 Kings xviii. 37. Buxt. *Lex.*, p. 2146. Originally it was simply a natural outburst of most intense pain, such as grief or indignation, or of both these emotions. Hence it would be voluntary, and not subject to a special ordinance. But at a later period, when many of these outbursts were more theatrical than real, their exercise was regulated by special rules, according to Maimonides, quoted by Buxtorf, just as similar manifestations were made the subject of regulation in the mediæval Church.

* [So also Alford: "There shall be a sign of the truth of what I say, over and above this confession of mine."—P. S.]

The rent made in the garment was from the neck downward, and about a span (*palmus*) in length. The body dress and the outer garment were left untouched: "*in reliquis vestibus corpori accommodatis omnibus fit, etiamsi decem fuerint.*" Hence τὰ ἱμάτια.—Saurin: Here was an infallible high-priest; was it duty implicitly to trust and to follow him? An argument against the Romish conception of faith as a blind submission to the absolute authority of the Church and the pope.*

He hath spoken blasphemy.—An explanation of his symbolical action, and at the same time the pronouncing of sentence, which, according to the law, would in such a case be that of death. On the supposition of their unbelief, and of their view that the statement of Christ was false, His declaration that He was the Messiah, as well as of the manner in which He sustained that office, would be peculiarly repugnant to them. But then, even on the high-priest's own showing, it was he, and not Christ, who was guilty of blasphemy, since he had, in his authoritative capacity, obliged Jesus to take this oath. Thus the conduct of the judges themselves led to what they regarded as the crime, which in turn they condemned, thus condemning themselves. But viewed in its true light and spirit, the presumptuous high-priest alone and his compeers were the blasphemers.

What further need have we of witnesses?—An involuntary admission that they were at a loss for witnesses. At the same time, it also implies that they wished to found the charge against Jesus solely upon His own declaration that He was the Messiah. In point of fact, a confession of guilt would render a further examination of witnesses unnecessary. Caiaphas, however, presupposes that the members of the Sanhedrin shared his own unbelief. In his hot haste he takes this for granted: **Behold, ye have now heard His blasphemy.**

Ver. 66. **He is worthy of death.**—As they imagined, according to the law, Lev. xxiv. 16; comp. Deut. xviii. 20. A full statement of the sentence, which Caiaphas had already implied when he declared Jesus guilty of blasphemy. According to de Wette and Meyer, this was merely a preliminary expression of opinion on the part of the Sanhedrin, while the formal resolution was only arrived at next morning, ch. xxvii. 1. In our view, this sentence was already full and final, although in point of form it may not have been quite complete. For, (1) the Sanhedrin had probably to be convoked in a formal manner; (2) that tribunal was, according to Jewish law, prohibited from investigating any capital crime during the night. Besides, all haste in pronouncing condemnation was interdicted; nor could a sentence of death be pronounced on the same day on which the investigation had taken place. Probably the Sanhedrin may have wished to elude this provision by entering on the examination during the night. But this object was not in reality secured, since the Jewish day commenced in the evening. *See* Friedlieb, *Archæol. of the History of the Passion*, p. 95. On other violations of the proper legal procedure in this case, *see* p. 87. (3) According to Roman law, a sentence pronounced before the dawn was not regarded as valid (Sepp. *Leben Jesu*, iii. 484). (4) What was most important, the Jews were required to couch their sentence of condemnation in the form of a charge which they might hope Pilate would sustain; for the Roman governor was required to confirm the Jewish verdict of death (Joseph. *Arch.* xx. 9, 1). The ill-treatment of the Lord immediately afterward shows that the Sanhedrin regarded even this first sentence as final. "It is sad that many modern Jews are still found attempting to defend the sentence of death pronounced upon Jesus. Thus the *Liber Nizzachon*, ed. by Wagenseil, 1681, p. 50; and SALVADOR, *Histoire des Institutions de Moise et du Peuple Hebr.*, Paris, 1828, ii. 85. They maintain that Jesus was rightly condemned, because, 1. He arrogated to Himself Divine dignity (Deut. xiii. 1), and because, 2. His work and mission tended toward the overthrow of Judaism, the undermining of the authority of the highest tribunal, and consequently the ruin of the people. Compare, on the other hand, VON AMMON, *Fortbild d. Christenth.*, vol. iv." Heubner.

Ver. 67. **Then they spit in His face.**—With reference to the ill-treatment to which the Lord was subjected before the Sanhedrin, we must call to mind that, even in the house of Annas, He was struck by one of the officers (John xviii. 22). De Wette and Meyer are mistaken in supposing that this ill-treatment is recorded in another connection in Luke xxii. 63. Manifestly the latter Evangelist there refers to what had taken place at a period intermediate between the first examination before Caiaphas and the final examination on the following morning, related in ver. 66, which describes this final meeting, in terms similar to the narrative of the first examination given by Matthew. That the two meetings must have resembled each other, is evident from the circumstance that the second was in part merely a repetition of the first, certain formalities being now observed. There are, however, certain peculiarities about each of them. In reference to the account of the ill-treatment itself, we notice that the narratives of the various Evangelists supplement, but do not contradict, each other. In all probability, the spitting in His face occurred immediately after His condemnation. It may be regarded as a consequence of the sentence, *spitting* being considered among the Jews as the expression of the greatest contempt (Deut. xxv. 9; Num. xii. 14). "This insult was punished with a fine of four hundred drachmas [the drachma being equal to about 15 American cents]. Even to spit before another was regarded as an offence, and treated as such, by heathen also. Thus Seneca records that it was inflicted at Athens upon Aristides the Just, adding, at the same time, that with considerable difficulty one individual was at last found willing to do it." Braune. But as those who were excommunicated were regarded as beyond the pale of the law, this expression of contempt was specially applied to them (comp. Isa. l. 6). Accordingly, the members of the Sanhedrin may have considered themselves warranted to take part in this manifestation of sanctimonious zeal. Their conduct served as the signal for bodily maltreatment on the part of the officers by striking Him with fists (described by the term κολαφίζειν). The other particulars added by Matthew took place on a later occasion. From the narratives of Mark and Luke (*see* my *Life of Jesus*, ii. 3, p. 1477) we gather that, after the sentence pronounced by Caiaphas, Jesus was led through the hall, where the servants were warming themselves, into another prison, and that at the very moment when Peter denied Him for the third time. There the guard which was to watch

* [The Edinb. ed. omits the last sentence, and turns *Saurin*, the well-known French Reformed pulpit orator who died at the Hague in 1730, into *Saurinus*, as if he were some old Latin divine.—P. S.]

the person of Jesus till the final examination on the following morning, commenced to maltreat Him, as fully detailed in the Gospel by Luke. This guard was, therefore, different from the officers who had formerly insulted Him. The expression ἐῤῥάπισαν is generally referred to smiting with the *hand* [so also in the E. V.: they *smote Him* with the palms of *their hands*]; but Beza, Ewald, Meyer, and others, apply it to smiting with *rods*.* Both renderings are equally warranted by the text. From Luke and Mark we infer that the scoffing which now took place was accompanied and followed by smiting with rods.

Ver. 68. **Prophesy unto us, Thou Christ.**—The scoffing was directed against His prophetic dignity, or, as they supposed, against the prophetic title which He claimed. According to Luke xxii. 64, they blindfolded and then struck Him on the face, asking Him to prophesy which of them had inflicted the indignity. Fritzsche interprets it as meaning: *Predict to us who shall smite Thee*; but in that case it would have been needless to have covered His face. As a prophet, He was to tell them what He could not see. The devilish fanaticism of the superiors had communicated itself to the lowest officials, and spread in the way of sympathy from the Jewish temple guard even to the Roman soldiers. The officers became a band of murderers around Him (*see* Ps. xxii.; the bulls of Bashan).

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. Jesus, silent before His accusers, a living expression of the truth, in its concrete form, as confidently relying on its eternal victory. Before His bright consciousness of truth all false testimonies melted away, as shadows and mist are chased by the rays of the sun. The last false testimony, for which the requisite number of witnesses had been procured (although the expressions in Matthew and Mark differ in reference to it), could scarcely weigh against Him, since, along with the miraculous destruction of the temple, it spoke of its miraculous restoration. After all, it only implied that He asserted His ability to perform the works of the Messiah. Thus His enemies were ultimately obliged to try Him simply upon the issue whether He was the Messiah. This alone, of all the charges, now remained. In other words, they dared to set their own miserable authority against all the glorious evidences by which He was accredited as the Messiah and the Son of God.

2. Properly speaking, the saying of Christ, "Destroy this temple," etc., which two years previously He had uttered at the time of the Passover, properly meant—You seek to kill Me; kill Me then: I shall rise again. It was the curse of their fanatical dulness and misunderstanding, and of their false hearing, that they converted this very saying into a charge on which they condemned Him to death.

3. The ancient Church allegorically interpreted Christ's silence before the secular and the ecclesiastical tribunals, as implying that He answered not a word because, as poor, guilty sinners, we must and would have been silent at the judgment-seat of God. But the tribunals of Caiaphas and Pilate could only in point of form and appearance serve as an emblem of the judgment-seat of God. In reality, they exhibited the fact, that the secular and religious authorities of the ancient world were wholly devoted to the service of darkness, and hence given up by the Lord to the judgment of self-condemnation. On the other hand, however, this judgment of self-condemnation, which sinful humanity executed upon itself in condemning the Christ of God, is the sentence which Christ by His silence took upon Himself as the woe of humanity, in order to transform, by His sympathy and self-surrender, the punishment of the world into an expiatory atonement.

4. *Christ, the Son of God.*—"The former title was probably mentioned first, because, as it did not embody the real ground of accusation, the high-priest may have expected that Jesus would more readily assent to the query when couched in that form. For, even in the eyes of such a tribunal, the mere claim to Messiahship could not by any possibility be regarded as a crime deserving of death, so long as no attempt whatever had been made to prove the falseness of the assertion. All this appears still more plainly from the narrative as given by Luke, in which the question, 'Art Thou then the Son of God?' is put separately from the other, seemingly called forth by the announcement that they would see Him sitting on the right hand of the power of God.—Many, in fact most Jews at that time, understood that title (Son of God) as only referring to the Messianic kingship of Jesus, without connecting with it the idea of eternal and essential Sonship. But Caiaphas evidently intended this expression to imply something more than the former designation of *Christ*. He and the Sanhedrin wittingly attached to it the peculiar meaning which, on previous occasions, had been such an offence to them (John v. 18; x. 33); and Jesus, fully understanding their object, gave a most emphatic affirmation to their inquiry. Of all the testimonies in favor of the divinity of Christ, this is the most clear and definite." Gerlach.

5. The testimony and the oath of Christ.—Calmly did He utter the reply which insured His death. The Faithful Witness (Rev. i.) did not falter or fail. And at the very moment when He surrendered Himself to an unrighteous judgment unto death, did the full consciousness of His kingly glory burst upon Him.

6. By the sentence of the Sanhedrin, the people of Israel rejected their Messiah, apparently with all due observance of legal forms (although in contravention of several legal ordinances), but in utter violation of the spirit and import of the law. Thereby the nation rejected itself, and destroyed the theocratical and political import of its temple. *See* Eph. ii. 15. It was in reality the Sanhedrin itself which, by condemning Jesus, condemned the temple, the city, the theocracy, and the whole ancient world. From this sentence of death upon the Lord, the world can only recover in and through the new life in Christ.

7. *Besides, I say unto you*, etc.—*On the right hand of power—of the majesty of God*, Ps. cx.—"Jesus here announces to His judges the judgment of His future advent. He intimates that henceforth they were to be continually visited by dreadful visions of His sovereignty. They would ever see Him. Wherever omnipotence would manifest itself, there would He also appear along with it, since all its operations should be connected with His kingdom. Above all the clouds which were to darken the sky, would He ever and again appear as the light of new eras, as the morning star, and the sun of a brighter and better future,—and that from this time onward, until the final revelation of His glory over the last

* [Comp. the Crit. Note No. 8, p. 490.—P. S.]

clouds which would ascend from a burning world" (*Leben Jesu*). "These words of our Lord show that His coming in the clouds of heaven referred not only to His final and visible advent at the last day, but also to the events heralding and typifying His return." Gerlach.

8. With this grand utterance the Lord Jesus directly met His enemies on the very ground of Scripture to which, in their hypocrisy, they had appealed. The reference here is to the prediction of Daniel, in ch. vii. 13, concerning the glory of the Son of Man; hence also the final application of this prophecy to the Son of Man, who from the first had referred it to Himself.

9. We might reasonably have expected that, after Christ had been condemned by an ecclesiastical tribunal on the charge of blasphemy, such accusations would not again have been laid by or before any who professed to be His disciples, but that all such questions would have been left to be settled by the Lord Himself. But the Inquisition has pursued the path first trodden by Caiaphas. The Church of Christ must commit the judgment upon such sins to God Himself, while the State may enact such laws against blasphemy and crimes of sacrilege as it may deem necessary for the well-being of the land.

10. The last council of traditionalism in its full and final blindness, an antitype of similar councils in the Christian Church.

11. The spitting upon Jesus, as predicted in Isa. liii. Gerlach: "Condemned as a blasphemer, He was treated as an *outlaw*, and exposed to every indignity and attack."

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The Son of God surrendered into the hands of sinners.—The holy Judge before the iniquitous judgment of the world.—The judgment of the world upon the Judge of the world: 1. The false witnesses over against the Faithful Witness of God; 2. the criminal occupying the seat of the high-priest, and the High-Priest standing in the place of the criminal; 3. blasphemy in the garb of zeal for God, and the loftiest praise of God designated as blasphemy; 4. the suicide of the world in the sentence pronounced upon the Prince of life, and the life of the world in the readiness of Christ to submit unto death; 5. the picture of hell and the picture of heaven in the insults heaped upon the Lord.—The judgment of man on the Saviour (a judgment of God): 1. The world given up to complete and full blindness and guilt unto death; 2. the Son of God given up to complete and full suffering, and to love of redemption.—In the judgment of man, that of God is ever present. It appears either: 1. By means of the judgment of man; or else, 2. beyond and above the sentence of man.—How frequently have spiritual tribunals pronounced their own sentence!—False witness as gradually developing and appearing in the course of history.—The misapprehensions of fanaticism the source of its mistakes.—The holy silence of the Lord, a most solemn divine utterance: 1. Concerning the guilt of the world, and His own innocence; 2. concerning its implacableness and His gracious compassion.—The holy utterance of the Lord after His holy silence.—His oath; in taking it, Jesus, the Eternal One, swore by Himself (Isa. xlv. 23).—The oath of Jesus the seal of truth.—The Faithful Witness who seals and confirms all that God has said, 2 Cor. i. 20; Rev. iii. 14.—The assumed appearance of zeal, and genuine holy indignation.—"What further need have we of witnesses?" or, how malice always betrays itself.—"Hereafter (or, henceforth) ye shall see;" or the roll of thunder in the distance.—Christ's abiding consciousness of His royal rank as appearing in, and standing the test of, the hour of its severest trial.—The appeal of Christ to His own judgment-seat as unto the tribunal of God.—The insults offered unto the Lord, or the bitter mocking of Satan in the fury of man.—How hell seeks to scoff at the King of heaven.—The dark shadows which ever follow hypocritical religiosity: 1. It is always connected with coarseness and rudeness; 2. it seems to take pleasure in satanic malice and love of mischief.—How ingenious fanaticism has ever proved in calling for the torments of hell, while boasting that *it alone* possessed the keys of the kingdom of heaven.—Infectious character of the evil example set by spiritual leaders.—The peace of Christ during that dreadful night, like the moon above dark lowering clouds.—The long and anxious hours. —Daniel in the lion's den; Christ among tigers and serpents.—The spiritual prison-house.—When led before the secular authorities, He was set free from the authority of the spiritual rulers.—The sorrow and pain which the enemies of the Lord prepared for themselves, when inflicting pain upon Him. —The moral desolation which, from the beginning to the end, ever accompanies a spurious zeal for religion: 1. It falsifies and perverts testimony; 2. it applies the law against truth and righteousness; 3. turns judgment into mockery of judgment; 4. it transforms the ministers of justice and the people into lawless murderers; 5. it involves even the secular power in its guilt and ruin.—Moral rudeness also in the service of the evil one.—Moral rudeness, the delight and the instrument of hypocritical cunning.—The sufferings and the gentleness of Jesus amidst the coarse rudeness of the world.—The sufferings of the members of Christ (His martyrs) amidst the coarse gibes of the world.—The covering of the face of Jesus a sign that, even while setting Him at nought, they dared not encounter the light of His eyes.—The spitting in His face a scoffing of the *highest personality* and individuality, implying at the same time self-rejection of their own human individuality.—An emblem also of all sin, as it tends to efface personality.—The impotence of human and satanic malice against the triumphant self-consciousness of the Divine Saviour.—The heavenly pattern of perfect patience and endurance.—The sins which He there bore, He bore for all, and for us among the number.

Starke:—*Canstein*: Even the true Church and its whole solemn assembly may err and fail, if they set aside the word of God, Ex. xxxii. 7-10.—We may "follow" Jesus, yet not in the right spirit or manner.—Danger of fellowship with men of the world (Peter warming himself by the fire of coals). —If we are weak, we must avoid fellowship with those whose intercourse might have a tendency to render us still more weak.—Solemn ordinances of God against false witnesses, Ex. xxiii. 1; Deut. xix. 18. But these wicked judges not only admitted, but even suborned false witnesses.—While seeking to entangle Jesus, they entangled themselves.—*Canstein*: Even the most sacred ordinances of God are capable of being desecrated by men.—*Zeisius*: The enemies of Christ at one and the same time accusers, witnesses, and judges: thus frequently even in our own day.—*Quesnel*: A most vivid picture of

what envy still does every day against the people of God.—*Hedinger:* Attend, O my soul; thy Saviour suffers for the false witness of thy tongue, for thy hypocrisy, etc.—When wicked rulers and judges occupy the high places, vile persons will always be found ready to lend themselves as their tools.—*Zeisius:* If the words of Christ, who was eternal Wisdom and Truth, were perverted, why should we wonder that His servants and children suffer from similar misrepresentations?—The testimony of Christ after His silence; similarly, may we not remain silent when the glory of God or His truth are in question.—*Zeisius:* The confession that Christ is the Son of God, to this day the rock of offence (to Jews, Turks, heathens, and unbelieving professors of Christianity).—Judicial blindness of the servants of Satan in declaring truth to be blasphemy, and blasphemy truth.—*Canstein:* by this Christ expiated the sins which are committed in judicial procedures.—*Zeisius:* The spitting upon Jesus, etc., the expiation of our sins, that our faces might not be ashamed before God, but that we might obtain eternal honor and glory.—*Quesnel:* You who adorn and paint your faces, behold the indignity offered to the face of Jesus, for your sakes!—The members of Christ should willingly and readily submit to every kind of scorn and insult.—Men dare to insult the Almighty as if He could be "blindfolded."

Gerlach:—While Peter denied Jesus, He confessed before Caiaphas that good confession by which our souls are saved.—Here we behold Jesus taking a solemn and judicial oath, to the effect that He was the Son of God; which He still further confirmed by adding that they would see Him again in the glory of His exaltation, as Judge of the world, and as their Judge.—The vast contrast between Jesus, who entered watching and praying into the temptation, which He had overcome within before He encountered it without, and Peter, who in self-confidence rushed into danger, without any preparation.—The insults heaped upon Jesus were not only the expression of the personal hatred of His enemies, but intended, if possible, completely to destroy His influence and position in popular estimation.

Heubner:—For our sakes, Christ had to go many a road of sorrow, surrounded by the band of the wicked. Let us count: 1. The road from Gethsemane to Annas; 2. that from Annas to Caiaphas; 3. from Caiaphas to Pilate; 4. from Pilate to Herod; 5. from Herod to Pilate; 6. from Pilate to the hall of judgment (although Pilate lived in the *Prætorium*, the soldiers occupied another part; hence it was not "from Pilate to the judgment-hall," but from the hall of judgment to where the soldiers were); 7. from thence to Golgotha. These sorrowful roads Jesus would not have been obliged to tread, had not our feet declined from the ways of God.—Christ led before Caiaphas: the true High-Priest before the spurious, the Just before the unjust, the Innocent One before His bitter enemies, who had long before resolved upon His death, John xi. 50.—A night trial. The prince of darkness himself presided unseen over this meeting.—The members of the Sanhedrin deceived themselves and each other by the tacit assumption of possessing divine authority.—(Rambach.) Let us not be deceived by the semblance of outward dignity and position, but seek grace to have our eyes opened so as to penetrate through the mist, and the pretensions of those who at heart are the enemies of Christ.—Christ was arraigned before two tribunals: the ecclesiastical, which took cognizance of the first, and the secular tribunal, which took cognizance of the second, table of the law. We have transgressed both tables of the law.—*They sought false witness:* the sentence had been beforehand resolved upon.—Falsehood must enter into the service of murder.—*Though many false witnesses came:* society abounds in venal instruments of iniquity.—Every false witness is in opposition to the holy God of truth; hence such will not only be put to shame, but even their false testimony must ultimately subserve the truth.—Calumny omits or adds (or perverts), as it may serve its purpose, so as to give falsehood the semblance of truth.—It is the peculiar artifice of the evil one to mix some element of truth in every lie.—Thus have the enemies of revelation frequently perverted the Bible.—The silence of Jesus: 1. Wise; 2. dignified; 3. putting His enemies to shame and condemning them; 4. conciliatory; 5. a holy example to His followers. (The biographies of Franke, Rengeltaube, Boos, Zinzendorf, and others.)—The great and grievous damage often resulting from controversies is solely caused by our own premature and hasty conduct.—The solemn confession of Jesus: 1. Wise and necessary: 2. holy and sacred; 3. heroic, or unshrinking, 1 Tim. vi. 13; 4. unhesitating and decided; 5. an example to His martyrs.—The different bearing and relationship in reference to the truth (on the part of Jesus, of Pilate, of the high-priests, of the false witnesses, of Judas).—*Nevertheless* (*but, besides*), *I say unto you.* A most solemn thunder-call to His enemies. Its confirmation appeared immediately on His death (the darkness, the earthquake, etc.).—They who will not believe in the divine character of Jesus must soon experience it to their terror and confusion.—It is terrible to His enemies, but most comforting to His friends.—The faithfulness of the Lord met by the mere semblance of the fear of God.—A painful and sleepless night to the Lord. Under the Old Testament, the high-priest was wont to spend the night before the day of atonement waking; so the true High-Priest also. A consolation this to sufferers during their sleepless nights.—Subordinates imitate their superiors and the higher classes, 1 Cor. ii. 8.—The face of man the characteristic and special index of his individuality; to spit upon the face, is to set at nought the peculiar individuality of the man. In the present instance it was Jesus. His face was the face of God, John xiv. 9. His holy face, which angels adore, veiling their countenances, was here insulted. A setting at nought of His person, and at the same time of His prophetical office.—Beware of a scoffing spirit, and of fellowship with scorners, Ps. i. 1.—Alas! how frequently is Christ still set at nought among us, wittingly and unwittingly, by neglect and contempt of His word, or by jokes and witticisms in connection with it! For the present He bears with it, but the time shall come when judgment will be passed upon those daring scoffers.—Let the reproach of Christ be our choicest adorning.

J. W. König:—What a change! In the night (of the nativity), when heaven descended upon earth, etc., the seraphim opened their song of joy and praise, etc. In this, the last night of His life, the Lord of heaven is set at nought.—*Rieger:*—This question, whether Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, still proves the testing-point of unbelief and worldly mindedness. He that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God overcometh the world.—*Braune:*—No criminal has ever endured what Jesus had to suffer; at least in no other case have cruelty and malice been

so grievously at work.—As on that occasion, in the obscurity of night, so still, many an attempt against Christ is made in the darkness of the world of this life.

SEVENTH SECTION.

CHRIST AND PETER.

CHAPTER XXVI. 69–75.

(Mark xiv. 66–72; Luke xxii. 56–62; John xviii. 15–27.)

69 Now Peter sat [was sitting] without in the palace [court, αὐλῇ][1]: and a damsel
70 came unto him, saying, Thou also wast with Jesus of Galilee [the Galilean].[2] But he
71 denied before *them*[3] all, saying, I know not what thou sayest. And when he was gone
out into [going toward] the porch, another *maid* [ἄλλη] saw him, and said unto them[4]
that were there, This *fellow* [man, οὗτος] was also with Jesus of Nazareth [the Naza-
72, 73 rene].[5] And again he denied with an oath, I do not know the man. And after
a while came unto *him* they that stood by [they that stood by came], and said to Peter,
Surely thou also art *one* of them; for thy speech bewrayeth [betrayeth, or discovereth,
74 δῆλόν σε ποιεῖ] thee. Then began he to curse[6] and to swear, *saying*,[7] I know not [I
do not know, οὐκ οἶδα, as in ver. 72] the man. And immediately the [a][8] cock crew.
75 And Peter remembered the word of Jesus, which said unto him [when he said],[9] Before
the [a] cock crow, thou shalt [wilt] deny me thrice. And he went out, and wept bit-
terly.

[1] Ver. 69.—[The ἔξω, *without*, plainly shows that αὐλή cannot mean here the *palace* itself, but the interior, quadrangular and open hall, or court-yard, to which there was a passage (sometimes arched) from the front part of the house, called πυλών or προαύλιον, ver. 71; Mark xiv. 68. *See* Crit. Note on ver. 8, p. 459. The place where the Saviour stood before Caiaphas was probably an audience-room on the ground-floor, in the rear or on the side of the court-yard.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 69.—[Literally after the Greek: τοῦ Γαλιλαίου, which, in the mouth of the enemies of Christ in Judæa, had a contemptuous meaning. So Julian the Apostate used to call Christ, and he is reported (although on insufficient authority) to have died with the exclamation: "Galilean, thou hast conquered!"—P. S.]

[3] Ver. 70.—The αὐτῶν is doubtful, as many authorities are against it. Still the fact that it is more difficult, speaks in its favor, inasmuch as the αὐτοί are not mentioned. [The English Version italicizes it; it may as well be omitted, being superfluous.]

[4] Ver. 71.—Αὐτοῖς ἐκεῖ [for τοῖς ἐκεῖ] is best supported.

[5] Ver. 71.—[Τοῦ Ναζωραίου has a similar contemptuous meaning as τοῦ Γαλιλαίου, ver. 69, and *Nazaræans*, as well as *Galilæans* became nicknames of the Christians.—P. S.]

[6] Ver. 74.—[*To curse* is somewhat ambiguous for καταναθεματίζειν. The meaning is: he invoked curses on himself in confirmation of the truth of his assertion. Lange: *Da fing er an mit Bannfluch* (Verwünschung) *und Eid sich zu verschwören*.—P. S.]

[7] Ver. 74.—[This interpolation should be omitted, since it "destroys the proper connection, and gives a false sense to the preceding words." (Conant.)—P. S.]

[8] Ver. 74.—[All the four Evangelists omit the definite article before ἀλέκτωρ for the reason stated in the note on ver. 34, p. 478.—P. S.]

[9] Ver. 75.—[Ἰησοῦ εἰρηκότος, *quod dixerat*, in the Vulgate and Syriac Version. To refer it to ῥήματος, as in the English Version, would require τοῦ εἰρηκότος. The best authorities omit αὐτῷ, but Lange retains it.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

On the manner and circumstances under which Peter gained access to the palace of the high-priest, *see* the Gospel of John.

Ver. 69. **Now Peter was sitting without.**—"The expression ἔξω must be taken relatively to the interior of the house in which Jesus underwent examination. In ver. 58 the term ἔσω was used, because Peter is represented as going from the street into the court." Meyer.

Ver. 69. **A damsel,**—*i. e.*, a female slave, as contradistinguished from the other mentioned in ver. 71. The former (who, according to John xviii. 17, "kept the door") said: **"Thou also wast with Jesus the Galilean;"** the latter: **"with Jesus the Nazarene."** Both maids had gathered their information by hearsay; but, although ignorant, they were malevolently disposed. Probably the statement was made in both cases in malicious banter, or light ridicule, as the charge evidently led to no further consequences.

Ver. 70. **He denied before them all.**—Before the servants of the high-priest and the officials.—**I know not what thou sayest.**—A mode of expression which might be taken as denying the denial: I do not even understand what thou meanest. Of course this, however, implied a denial of the charge itself, although Meyer lays undue emphasis upon it when interpreting it: So far from having been with Him, I do not even know, etc.

Vers. 71 and 72. **And when he was going out into (toward) the porch.**—After his first and indirect denial, Peter began to feel the painfulness of his situation, and wished to go away, or at any rate to be nearer the door, so as to secure a retreat. But in order to conceal his intention of leaving, he continued still for a short time in the porch. Accordingly, he went from the court or αὐλή, which enclosed the house, toward the porch. In our opinion, the ὁ πυλών refers to the same as the προαύλιον in Mark xiv. 68 (which Meyer denies). It was then that, according to Mark, Peter denied Jesus a second time, after having risen from warming himself at the fire. "*Another maid saw him* (when going away), *and* (following him) *said unto them that were there* (probably the guard at the gate): *This one was also with Jesus the Nazarene.*" Then the second distinct denial ensued, confirmed by an oath, and by the contemptuous expression: "*I do not know the man.*" The circumstance that Peter made use of an oath is recorded by Matthew alone. The particle ὅτι probably refers to the confirmation by the oath.

Ver. 73. **And after a while, they that stood by came and said to Peter.**—Primarily referring to those who had been at the gate. But the language of the text does not prevent our understanding it to mean, that in the interval a number of persons had come from the court and joined the group. In fact, according to Luke, a considerable interval had elapsed, before general attention had been called forth and fixed on Peter.—**Surely thou also art one of them.**—An oath against the oath of Peter.—**For thy speech also betrayeth thee.**—"Beside other circumstances, by which the maid recognized thee. The pronunciation, the dialect, ἡ λαλία of the Galilæans was defective in the utterance of the gutturals, so that no distinction was perceptible between א, ע, ה. Besides, the Galilæans also pronounced the ש like ת." De Wette. The pronunciation of the people of Galilee was uncouth and indistinct; hence they were not allowed to read aloud in the Jewish synagogues. The Talmudists relate a number of amusing anecdotes about the curious misunderstandings occasioned by the indistinctness of pronunciation in Galilee. *See* Friedlieb, p. 84.

Ver. 74. **Then began he.**—He meets and outdoes the asseveration "*Surely*," used by the servants, by beginning **to invoke curses on himself and to swear.**

Ver. 74. **And immediately a cock crew.**—De Wette: "The statement in Mishna, *Baba Kama* vii. 7, that fowls were not allowed to be kept in Jerusalem, is probably incorrect. It is contrary to what is related in *Hieros. Erubin*, fol. 26, cp. 1; comp. Lightfoot *ad v.* 34."—It was indeed contrary to the Levitical law of purity to keep fowls in Jerusalem, because these animals pick their food in dirt and mud, and might thus occasion the defilement of sacrifices and other dedicated offerings. But is it likely that the Roman soldiers in the castle of Antonia would care for such Jewish ordinances? And even with reference to the Jews, we read that the Sanhedrin had on one occasion ordered a cock to be stoned, because it had picked out the eyes of a little child, and thereby caused its death. (Sepp, *Leben Jesu*, iii. 475.)—Plinius observes that the second crowing of the cock (*gallicinium*) took place during the fourth watch of the night. Friedlieb, p. 81.

Ver. 75. **Thou wilt thrice deny Me.**—Bengel has, in his *Gnomon*, given the following satisfactory explanation of the fact, that the Gospels speak only of a threefold denial on the part of Peter: "*Abnegatio ad plures plurium interrogationes, facta uno paroxysmo, pro una numeratur.*" By dint of that pressure of the letter at the expense of the import and spirit of history, which is so common with a certain school of critics (*Leben Jesu*, ii. 3, 1490), Strauss and Paulus have maintained that the Gospels record more than three denials on the part of Peter (Paulus speaks of eight distinct denials). But a closer inquiry shows that the three occasions are specially and separately enumerated in the Gospels:—

First denial.—Immediately on entering the palace, John xviii. 17, and on the charge of the maid who kept the door. According to Matthew (ver. 69), in the court; according to John and Mark, at the fire, where the servants warmed themselves; according to Luke, by the light of the fire.

Second denial.—According to John's narrative, Peter was still standing by the fire and warming himself, probably with the design of covering a speedy retreat by assuming the appearance of unconcern. According to Matthew, he was now about to leave, when another maid attacked him, and people gathered around him in the porch. Luke reports one of these bystanders as already expressing the general feeling in the words: "Thou art also of them."

Third denial.—Again Peter had tarried for some time in the porch. The false oath which he had taken had allayed the rising indignation of the people, when another fancied that he recognized him by his speech. Soon the servants declared that his speech betrayed him. Such a recognition would involve imminent peril of life. For, according to John, a relative of Malchus maintained that he had seen him in the garden with Jesus. Then Peter began to curse and swear, and immediately the cock crew (a second time), reminding and warning him. It appears that he had scarcely given any heed to the first crowing of the cock (Mark).

[On the different accounts of the threefold denial of Peter compare also the tables in the Greek and English *Harmonies*, Andrews' *Life of our Lord*, p. 491 sqq., and the remarks of Alford on Matt. xxvi. 69-75, 4th ed. (p. 268 sqq.). These minor variations with essential coincidences prove the independence of the Evangelists and confirm the truth of their narrative. "Whether we can arrange them or not, being thoroughly persuaded of the holy truthfulness of the Evangelists, and of the divine guidance under which they wrote, our faith is in no way shaken by such discrepancies. We value them rather, as testimonies to independence: and are sure, that if for one moment we could be put in *complete possession of all the details as they happened*, each account would find its justification, and the reasons of all the variations would disappear. And this I firmly believe will one day be the case." Alford (p. 269, in the 4th edition, where he corrects the errors of the corresponding note in the former edition).—P. S.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. This picture of the denial of the Lord as exhibited by the fall of that disciple who had been the first to confess Christ, has its peculiar and eternal import in the history of the Church. Hence we should study it: 1. In the source and antecedents of this denial; 2. in its various phases and stages; 3.

in the repentance which followed, and which led to the only true and lasting spiritual confession.

2. The fall of Peter a significant type of the Romish Church.

3. The look of the Lord, recorded in the Gospel of Luke, in its historical and in its eternal, ideal import for the Church.

4. The deep sorrow and suffering of the Lord caused by the denial of Peter, in its lasting import for the Church.

5. Peter went out into the black night, but not as Judas into the darkness of despair. Weeping bitterly, he awaited the dawn of another and a better morning. The angel of mercy accompanied him on that heavy road to spiritual self-condemnation which issued in the death of his old man, more especially of his former pride and self-confidence. And thus it came that he really accompanied Christ unto death, though in a very different and much better sense than he had intended. His repentance had to be completed,—he had to obtain peace and reconciliation from the mouth of Christ Himself, before he could offer the requisite satisfaction for his guilt toward man by making such a grand confession as would efface and obliterate the offence of his grand denial. It deserves special notice, that this progress of repentance and conversion in the case of Peter may serve as the prototype of the economy of genuine grace; while this procedure was reversed in the case of Judas, who wished first to offer human satisfaction before those enemies whose guilt he had shared, but who failed, in that manner, to come to Christ.

[6. WORDSWORTH: "Even soon after he had received the Holy Communion Peter denied his Master. But he repented and was pardoned. Hence then we may confute the Novatians, who refuse to restore those who fall into grievous sin after Baptism and the Holy Communion. And St. Peter's sin, and the sins of other saints, are written in Holy Scripture that we may not be high-minded, but fear; and that when we fall into sin we may repent. The grace given in the Holy Communion was *improved* by St. Peter into the means of godly repentance; but it was *perverted* by Judas to his own destruction. It was used as medicine by the one; and was abused into poison by the other." But the presence of Judas at the institution of the Lord's Supper is a matter of critical uncertainty (comp. John *versus* Luke) and of inherent improbability. The weight of patristic authority is in favor of his presence; but some of the best modern harmonists and commentators, as Meyer, Tischendorf, Robinson, Lichtenstein, Lange, Wieseler, Ellicott, and Andrews, deny it, and assume that the traitor left the paschal supper before the institution of the eucharist, for which in John's narrative we can find no place for insertion prior to the departure of Judas.—P. S.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Internal connection between the denial of Peter and the condemnation and injuries which Christ suffered at the hands of His enemies.—The denial of a disciple the most poignant sorrow to the Lord in the midst of His confession.—The Faithful Witness and the unfaithful disciple.—The denial of Peter intervening between his former and his later confession, or different kinds of confession.—The causes of the denial of Peter: 1. Self-exaltation on account of his former confession; 2. a morbid desire after confession beyond the measure of the strength of his faith; 3. want of sufficient maturity for the confession in life and in deed.—The giddiness and the stumbling of Peter, before his actual fall: 1. He underrated and neglected the warnings of Jesus; 2. he exalted himself above his fellow-disciples; 3. he neglected the proper preparation by watching and prayer; 4. he voluntarily and presumptuously rushed into danger.—How it deserves special notice, in the fall of Peter, that he had attempted to come forward as a witness for Christ with a conscience that was not void of blame and offence.—The sad after-history of the sword assault upon Malchus; or, how frequently times of fanatical defence of the faith are followed by seasons of open denial.—How it could come to pass that a poor maid, standing at the gate, could terrify into a denial *him* to whom the keys of the kingdom of heaven had been promised.—The triumph of the fear of man over that of God the source of denial.—He who tempts the Lord is on the way to deny Him.—The fatal boldness which rushes into the battle-field without having been sent: 1. Its portraiture as here presented: it wants a proper call, proper weapons, and proper spiritual courage. 2. Its fate: despondency, defeat, and the most imminent peril of soul.—How those who confess Jesus have to endure the most varied temptations to deny Him.—How the children of the world and the ministers of darkness combine, in the spirit of the evil one, to change our confession into a denial of Christ.—The unfailing mark of the disciples in their language and tone, also the indication of their fate: 1. It is to their highest spiritual benefit, if they are faithful; 2. or, again, to their shame and confusion, when they turn aside from the Lord.—The gradation of guilt in the denial of Peter: 1. Ambiguous evasion (a supposed unimportant falsehood); 2. distinct denial with a false oath: "I know not the man" (contemptuously); 3. awful abjuration, with solemn imprecations upon himself.—Every ban pronounced upon genuine Christians, an imprecation, in confirmation of the denial of Christ.—Peter did not wish to forsake the Lord, but he would fain have attempted to save both Jesus and himself by crafty *policy*.—In his view, everything formed part of this *policy:* the evasion, the false oath, and even the imprecations, were intended to carry out this plan.—How, as "the Faithful Witness," the Lord has expiated even the denials of His honest disciples, into which they have fallen through weakness.—How the faithfulness of Christ alone restores the unfaithful servant from imminent judgment: 1. Only His faithfulness: (*a*) in His gracious warning; (*b*) in His look of compassion and love; (*c*) in giving that warning and rousing sign (the crowing of the cock); (*d*) in His readiness to restore again the fallen disciple. 2. Blessed effects of that faithfulness on the part of Jesus: "He went out, and wept bitterly."—The warning tokens in nature, as accompanying the warning and rousing voice of the Spirit.—The repentance of Peter a constant call to repentance in the Church.—The marks of genuine repentance: 1. All the pride of self-righteousness ceases and is given up; 2. it is connected with a going out from the world; 3. it is characterized by a going forth with tears through night to light.—Bitter weeping, or a broken and contrite heart, the evidence of reconciling grace.—How the humiliation of the heart and the grace of our God always meet as eye to eye: 1. True humiliation and humility find no other resting-place than the loftiest height, even the grace of God; 2. the grace of God descends and rests

only in the lowest depth, even the broken and contrite heart.—Divine grace transforming the fall of Peter, as formerly that of David, into the introduction to a genuine and thorough conversion.—Will the so-called Romish Peter ever go forth from the palace of the high-priest, where he has denied Jesus, to weep bitterly?

Starke:—Hedinger: Self-confidence and presumption bring sorrow.—*Marginal Note by Luther:* Peter may have thought that his untruth could not injure any person, while it might profit him and insure his safety, and hence that it was lawful, or at least a matter of small moment; but he soon experienced what consequences the commencement of sin entailed.—*Canstein:* The fear of death.—*Zeisius:* Observe how sin grows and increases when it is not resisted. Therefore, be very careful to resist it in its commencement.—To stumble is human, to rise again Christian, to persevere in sin is devilish.

Lisco:—The denial of Peter.—1. Its source. (*a*) Its more remote occasion: (*aa*) transgression of the injunction of Jesus, John xiii. 36; (*bb*) neglect of the admonition, Matt. xxvi. 41. (*b*) Its deeper ground: (*aa*) unbelief in the word of the Lord, ver. 36; (*bb*) confidence in the strength of his love to Jesus and in his own firmness of will; (*cc*) proud presumption in the midst of danger. 2. The denial itself. (*a*) Manifestation of his fear of man, thoughtless haste, and impotence. (*b*) Starting-point: a lie. (*c*) Gradual and increasing development: at first merely a denial, then a false oath, and at last imprecations upon himself. 3. The conversion. (*a*) The crowing of a cock and the look of Jesus awaken him to a sense of the real state of matters. (*b*) He perceives the truthfulness and faithfulness of Jesus, and his own weakness. (*c*) Godly sorrow and repentance.—Thus we also learn from this history, how a man may be restored after having sadly declined and fallen into grievous sin.

Heubner:—Peter was here in the midst of a multitude of the ungodly.—The disciples of Christ cannot be long hid when among the men of this world.—Isa. xix. 18: the language of Canaan.—The more poignant our repentance, the more sweet and precious afterward the enjoyment of grace.—Wherein consisted the denial of Peter? 1. It was not a determined denial of the heart, nor a final or thorough renunciation of Jesus; 2. it was a concealment of his faith and allegiance, a denial of his discipleship.—Survey of the conduct of Peter: 1. It involved deep guilt; 2. grade of that guilt—(*a*) not a sin of malicious intent, (*b*) but of weakness.—In the sin of Peter, Jesus had to bear our human weaknesses.—Application: 1. The fall of Peter reminds us of the weakness of our own hearts, against which we must always be on our guard, despite our better feelings and aspirations; 2. a call to self-examination; 3. we must learn to place our whole confidence in the grace and intercession of Jesus. Hold fast your faith.

Braune:—Even down to the maid who guarded the gate, the servants of the high-priest were involved in the sin and injury committed against the Saviour.—Peter wished to do better than the other disciples, who all forsook Jesus and fled, but fell lower than they.—The world knows well how to remind us of such sword-cut, or how to avenge supposed or real injury.—These Jewish servants seem to have been proud of their pure pronunciation of the language; similarly, most of us try to shine and to outshine others.—After that, Peter also strengthened his brethren, as the Lord commanded him.—Godly sorrow worketh, etc.—From the Lord Jesus comes forgiveness of sin.

H. Müller:—Peter warms his hands and feet, while in the meantime, however, the heart freezes so far as the love of Jesus is concerned.—If a man forsakes the way in which the Lord calls him to walk, and seems to slink into corners, etc., he is outside of God's protection, and the devil has power over him.—If thy foot offend thee, etc.—He who warms himself by the fire of the ungodly, will deny Christ along with the ungodly.—*Ahlfeld:*—He that walks in his own strength, will assuredly meet with a speedy fall.—*Kapff:*—Why did Peter recover from his fall, and not Judas? 1. Because their sins differed; 2. because their repentance differed.

[Quesnel:—Every one carries in him the possibility of renouncing Christ.—There is nothing on which we can depend but the grace of God.—One temptation unresisted seldom fails of bringing on another and a third.—Peter joins perjury to infidelity. Let the example of an apostle make us tremble.—A small matter (a mean servant) makes us fall when God does not support us; a small matter (the crowing of a cock) raises us again, when His grace makes use of it.—P. S.]

[Burkitt:—The denial of Peter: 1. The sin: (*a*) a lie; (*b*) an oath (perjury); (*c*) an anathema and curse. 2. The occasion of it: (*a*) Peter followed Christ *afar off*, from fear and frailty; (*b*) he kept bad company with the enemies of Christ; (*c*) presumptuous confidence in his own strength and standing. 3. The repetition of the sin. If we yield to one temptation, Satan will assault us with more, and stronger: progress from bare denial to perjury and thus to imprecation. 4. The aggravating circumstances: (*a*) the person thus falling, a disciple, an apostle, the chief apostle, a special favorite of Christ; (*b*) the person denied, his Master, his Saviour and Redeemer, who just before had washed his feet and given him the sacrament; (*c*) the company of high-priests, and scribes, and elders, and their servants before whom Peter denied his Master; (*d*) the time of the denial, but a few hours after the communion; (*e*) the smallness of the temptation: a mere question of a servant girl, a door-keeper. Ah, Peter, how unlike thyself art thou at this time, not a rock, but a reed, a pillar blown down by a woman's breath. O frail humanity, whose strength is weakness!—In most of the saints' falls recorded in Scripture, either the first inciters or the accidental occasions were women. Adam, Lot, Sampson, David, Solomon, Peter. A weak creature may be a strong tempter.—The recovery and repentance of Peter: 1. Its suddenness. His sin was hasty and sudden under a violent passion of fear, contrary to his settled purpose, and hence much sooner repented of. 2. The means of his repentance: (*a*) the crowing of a cock; (*b*) Christ's looking upon Peter with an eye of mercy and pity which melted his heart and dissolved it into tears; (*c*) Peter's remembrance of Christ's prediction with a close application of it to his conscience. The manner of his repentance: (*a*) it was secret, *he went out* (*vere dolet qui sine teste dolet;* solitariness is most agreeable to an afflicted spirit); (*b*) sincere, *he wept bitterly;* (*c*) lasting and abiding, showing its effect on the whole subsequent life of Peter. "History (tradition) reports, that ever after, when St. Peter heard the crowing of a cock, he fell upon his knees and mourned; others say, that he was wont to rise at midnight and spend the time in penitent devotion between cock-crowing and day-light. And the Pa-

pists, who love to turn everything into superstition, began that practice of setting a cock upon the top of towers, and steeples, and chimneys, to put the people in mind of this sin of Peter and his repentance by that signal." (*d*) The repentance of Peter was attended with an extraordinary zeal for the service of Christ to the end of his life.—P. S.]

[Similar reflections and improvements in MATTHEW HENRY, GILL, DODDRIDGE, A. CLARKE, TH. SCOTT, and other practical English commentators. We add the last of the "Practical Observations" of THOMAS SCOTT: "If any have fallen even in the most dreadful manner, let them think of Peter's recovery and not despair; and let them recollect the words of Christ, as well as their own sins; that their tears, confessions, and humiliations may be mingled with hope. And let us all frequently remember our past follies, and manifold instances of ingratitude; that we may learn watchfulness, humility, caution, and compassion for the tempted and fallen, by the experience of our own numerous mistakes, sins, and recoveries."—P. S.]

EIGHTH SECTION.

JESUS AND HIS BETRAYER.—JUDAS AND THE HIGH-PRIESTS.

CHAPTER XXVII. 1–10.

(Mark xv. 1; Luke xxii. 66–xxiii. 1; John xviii. 28.)

1 When [But, δέ] the morning was come, all the chief priests and [the, οἱ] elders of
2 the people took counsel against Jesus to put him to death: And when they had bound
3 him, they led *him* away, and delivered him to Pontius Pilate the governor.[1] Then
Judas, which [who] had betrayed[2] him, when he saw that he was condemned, repented
himself [regretting, μεταμεληθείς],[3] and brought again [brought back] the thirty pieces
4 of silver to the chief priests and [the] elders, Saying, I have sinned in that I have betrayed
the innocent[4] blood [I sinned, or erred, in betraying innocent blood, ἥμαρτον
παραδοὺς αἷμα ἀθῷον].[5] And they said, What *is that* [it] to us? see thou *to that* [it].
5 And he cast down the pieces of silver in the temple, and departed [withdrew, or isolat-
6 ed himself, ἀνεχώρησε],[6] and went [away hence] and hanged himself. And the chief
priests took the silver pieces, and said, It is not lawful for to put them into the treasury,
7 because it is the price of blood. And they took counsel, and bought with them the
8 potter's field, to bury strangers in. Wherefore that field was called, The field of blood,
9 unto this day. Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jeremy [Jeremiah][7] the
prophet, saying, And they took the thirty pieces of silver, the price of him that was
valued [priced],[8] whom they of the children of Israel did value [priced, Gen. xxxvii.
10 28; Zech. xi. 12, 13; Jer. xviii. 1; xix. 12; xxxii. 6 ff.]; And gave them for the
potter's field, as the Lord appointed me [to me].[9]

[1] Ver. 2.—[Τῷ ἡγεμόνι, here = ἐπίτροπος, *procurator*, which was the proper official character and title of Pilate; but ἡγεμών is a more general term which applies to proconsuls, legates, or procurators. Hence *governor* may be retained. Vulgate and Beza translate: *præsidi* (but this title belonged to the President of Syria (Luke ii. 2), Pilate's superior); Castalio: *prætori* (in the wider acceptation of early Roman history); Tyndale, Coverdale, Cranmer, Genevan, Bishops': *deputy* (but this is used for ἀνθύπατος, *proconsul*, in Acts xiii. 7, 8, 12; xviii. 12; xix. 38); Campbell: *procurator* (correct, but not so generally intelligible as *governor*); Luther: *Landpfleger;* Ewald and Lange: *Statthalter.*—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 3.—Παραδούς according to B., L., cursive MSS., Lachmann, [and Tregelles. Tischendorf and Alford retain the usual reading: παραδιδούς.]

[3] Ver. 3.—[It is worth while to mark in the translation the difference between μεταμέλομαι, *to change one's care*, and μετανοέω, *to change one's mind* or *purpose*, and thus between the repentance of Peter, who abhorred the *cause*, his sin, and the remorse of Judas, who shrunk back from the *effect;* or the godly sorrow which leads to life, and the worldly regret which leads to death.—P. S.]

[4] Ver. 4.—In place of ἀθῷον (*innocent*) some manuscripts and translations read δίκαιον (*righteous*), which has too little authority.

[5] Ver. 4.—[So in accordance with the concise earnestness of the Greek, and the state of Judas. "The fewer words the better." Similarly Ewald: *Ich sündigte übergebend* [better: *verrathend*] *unschuldiges Blut*, and Conant: *I sinned*, etc. But Lange: *Ich habe gefehlt*, etc., *I erred;* Luther: *Ich habe übel gethan*, *I did evil*, which draws a nice distinction between blundering and sinning, and is perhaps better suited to the case of Judas, who, like Cain and Saul, had no real sense of sin itself in its horrible guilt and enormity, and hence no true repentance, but shrunk back in dismay from the consequences of sin. The Greek ἥμαρτον, however, admits of both translations. Comp. Lange's *Exeg. Notes.* Coverdale correctly omits the article before *innocent*, but the other older English Versions unmeaningly prefix it.—P. S.]

[6] Ver. 5.—[Lange lays stress on ἀνεχώρησε, and translates: *zog sich zurück (einsiedlerisch in die Oede).* See his *Exeg. Notes.*—P. S.]

[7] Ver. 9.—*Jeremiah* is left out by several cursive MSS. and in the Syriac and Persian translations. Cod. 22, and others, read Ζαχαρίου. [Cod. 22 is an inferior MS. of the eleventh century, and can therefore hardly claim any authority. On the difficulty of the true reading, see the *Exeg. Notes.*—P. S.]

[8] Ver. 9.—[So Conant, who substitutes *priced* for *valued*, to retain the verbal correspondence between *price* and *priced* as in the Greek τὴν τιμὴν τοῦ τετιμημένου. Comp. Ewald, who translates: *den Schatz des Geschätzten, welchen schätzten*, etc.—P. S.]

[9] Ver. 10.—[Συνέταξέ μοι, either *appointed to me*, as Scrivener and Conant propose, or *commanded me*, as Coverdale has it. The *appointed me* of the Authorized Version is susceptible of another meaning. Thus correct ch. xxviii. 16.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1. **When the morning was come.**—The formal meeting of the council must have taken place after six o'clock in the morning. The night of His betrayal into the hands of the high-priests was past, and the morning of His betrayal to the Gentiles had dawned. The deed, commenced in the night, was sufficiently developed and matured to be finished in clear day-light.—**All the chief priests and the elders of the people took counsel.**—This meeting of the Sanhedrin, which Luke describes in his Gospel, was intended at the same time to meet all the forms of law, and definitely to express the grounds of the charge against Jesus. But, as we have already seen, in point of fact, it only served to cover those violations of the law into which their reckless fanaticism had hurried them. One of the main objects of the Sanhedrin now was, to present the charge in such a light as to oblige Pilate to pronounce sentence of death. Accordingly, they agreed on the following course of procedure: 1. They demanded the absolute confirmation of their own sentence, without further inquiry into their proceedings (John xviii. 30). 2. Failing to obtain this, they accused Jesus as King of the Jews, *i. e.*, as Messiah, in the ambiguous, semi-religious and semi-political sense of that title. 3. When (according to John) Jesus repudiated the political character of His kingdom, they preferred against Him the charge of making the religious claim that He was the Son of God. But as the effect of this accusation proved the very opposite from what they had expected, they returned to the political charge, now threatening Pilate with laying before the Emperor the fact that Jesus had made Himself a king. No doubt the general outline of this procedure was planned and sketched in the meeting of the Sanhedrin. Of course, they could not have foreseen that Pilate himself would offer them the means to overcome his opposition, by setting Jesus and Barabbas before them on the same level.—**All the priests, elders, and scribes.**—[Matthew mentions only the first two of these three classes, but Luke, ch. xxii. 66, adds also the scribes.—P. S.] "Besides their common hatred, each of these three estates had their own special motive for hostility to the Lord. The *priests* were indignant that He should lay greater stress on obedience than on sacrifice; the *elders* were offended that He judged traditionalism by the standard of revelation; the *scribes*, that He contended against the service of the letter by the spirit of the word. In a thousand different ways had they felt their prejudices shocked, and their ambition and pride humbled. At last the hour of revenge had come. Thus they led Him before their supreme council. The language used by Luke (xxii. 66) seems to imply that they led Jesus, in formal procession, from the palace of the high-priest into the council-chamber, on the area of the temple. It is scarcely probable that they would have conducted Him, with such formalities, from the prison-chamber to the upper hall of the high-priest's palace. According to the Talmud, sentence of death could only be pronounced in the *Gazith* (the council-hall on the temple-mountain). *See* Friedlieb, p. 97 (who, however, questions the correctness of this statement). At any rate, it would appear indispensable that a formal meeting of the Sanhedrin should assemble on the temple-mountain" (*Leben Jesu*, ii. 3, p. 1786). On Sabbaths and feast-days the Sanhedrin met in an uncovered space, which was enclosed by a wall, in the vicinity of the court of the women, and not in the Gazith. In ordinary circumstances, judicial matters were not carried on upon the Sabbath-day. "Hence, notwithstanding the studied semblance of legality, the whole procedure was characterized by irregularity and violence." Wichelhaus, p. 211.

To put Him to death.—The resolution had been finally taken during the night, and their present object was to put that sentence and the charge against Jesus into proper form, as a means toward the end in view.

Ver. 2. **And when they had bound Him, they led Him away.**—They bound Him, even when they first seized Him (xxvi. 50; John xviii. 12). These fetters He also still bore when led from Annas to Caiaphas (John xviii. 24). They seem to have been removed during His examination before Caiaphas. After that they appear to have been again put upon the Lord. Now they proceed in a body (Luke) to hand over to the Roman procurator Him whom they had condemned. They calculated upon producing, by their formal procession in a body, so early in the morning, and that on the first day of the feast, the impression that Jesus had committed some fearful and unheard-of crime. For this purpose they now put Him again in fetters. Besides, this early and pompous procession would tend to terrify the friends of Jesus among the people, and to anticipate any possible movement in His favor. If Pilate had once sentenced Jesus, there would be less cause for apprehension on the score of a popular tumult. "The procession of the Sanhedrin passed from the council-chamber across the temple-mountain, in a northerly direction, toward the palace of the governor, which lay at the northern base of the temple-mountain. As the house of the high-priest was situated on the northern slope of the Upper City, or of Mount Zion, and a lofty archway led across the valley of the Tyropœon, connecting the temple-mountain with Mount Zion, it seems probable that Jesus may, before that, have been brought in formal procession across this high archway into the council-chamber on the temple-mount. As we may assume that Herod, the ruler of Galilee, resided, during his stay at Jerusalem, in the palace of Herod, which also stood on the northern slope of Mount Zion, Jesus must afterward have again been led from the hall of judgment, on the temple-mount, across that archway and back—a spectacle

of ignominy and woe." (From the author's *Leben Jesu*, ii. 3, p. 1502.)

And delivered Him.—The original παρέδωκαν contains an allusion to the second great betrayal of the Saviour. "After Judea became a Roman province (upon the deposition of King Archelaus), the Sanhedrin no longer possessed the *jus gladii*. Comp. John xviii. 31." Meyer.

Pontius Pilate.—The sixth Roman procurator of Judæa, and successor of Valerius Gratus. He held this office for ten years during the reign of the Emperor Tiberius (Joseph. *Antiq.* xviii. 4, 2). His arbitrary conduct, however, led to repeated risings of the Jews, which he suppressed by bloody measures (Joseph. *Antiq.* xviii. 3, 1; *De Bello Jud.* ii. 9, 2). He was accused before Vitellius, the Præses of Syria, who deposed and sent him to Rome, to answer before the Emperor for his administration. He was probably deposed from his office the same year as Caiaphas from the priesthood—in 36 p. C. (ær. Dion.). According to Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* ii. 7, and the *Chronic.* of the first year of Cajus, he committed suicide during the reign of Cajus Caligula. The opinion entertained of him by the Jews was affected by their fanaticism on the one hand, and on the other by his proud contempt of the Jewish nation. He affords one of the earliest instances of that antagonism between the Roman and heathen spirit of the world and Jewish fanaticism which, under the administration of his successors, attained such immense proportions, and at last burst forth in open war for independence. The bitter and derisive contemptuousness which he ever and again displayed, led to frequent conflicts with the leaders of the Jews, in which the obstinate determination and cunning of the latter generally secured the victory. This aversion to the Jews made it easier for him to take a favorable view of the cause of Jesus. To this must be added, the moral impression produced by the person of Jesus, the religious awe which the mysterious religious character of the Messiah evoked, and the warning of his wife. Under the influence of such feelings, he made unmistakable efforts to withdraw Jesus from the vengeance of His enemies, whose minds and motives he easily read, or at least sought to avoid having any part in His condemnation. Hence he sent Jesus to Herod, placed Him side by side with Barabbas, solemnly washed his hands, presented Him to the people after He had been scourged, etc. But he was too weak and unrighteous to pronounce what he must have felt a righteous sentence, and boldly to adhere to it as a matter of duty, instead of resorting to these numerous paltry devices. Hence also his carnal and devilish wisdom was overmatched by the superior cunning and skill of the Jewish priesthood. Pilate may serve as a type of the complete unbelief, worldly-mindedness, and morally impotent civilization of the ancient Greek and Roman world. According to the word of the Lord Himself, Pilate was guilty, but his sin was less than that of the priesthood which had delivered the Christ into his hands (John xix. 11). Ordinarily, Pilate appears not to have been so yielding. Philo, *legatio ad Caj.*: "His disposition was unyielding, nor was he moved to leniency toward daring malefactors." For the literature and history of Pilate, comp. Danz, *Univ. Wörterbuch*, sub *Pontius Pilate*. On the defence set up by some writers for Pilate, *see* Heubner, *Com.* p. 434, *note*. *See* also especially, Lavater, "*Pontius Pilate, or Human Character in all its Phases*." WINER, art. *Pilate* [and other Bibl. Encyclop.]. The apocryphal tales connected with Pilate are recorded in the "*Acta Pilati*." They are of a twofold character: 1. Such as were invented by Christians; 2. such as were of heathen origin, defamatory in their nature, circulated in the schools by order of Maximinus about the year 311. *See* Heubner, p. 427. The introduction of "Pontius Pilate" in the Creed shows that in the mind of the Church he was regarded as representing the ancient world, and in general the spirit of the world.

The governor, ἡγεμόνι,—the more general term. The more special designation of the office was ἐπίτροπος, *procurator*. Winer: "The official title of *procurator* or *eparch* was given to the chiefs of administration—commonly Roman knights—who were appointed along with the governors both of imperial and senatorial provinces, and whose duty it was to attend to the revenues of the imperial treasury, and to decide on all legal questions connected with this department. Occasionally they occupied the place of governor in smaller provinces, or in districts which had been conjoined with larger provinces, but were separately administered, when they had the command of the troops stationed in their district and administered the law even in criminal cases; the president of the province retaining, however, the superintendence of such administration, and being empowered to receive and hear accusations against the procurator. Comp. Joseph. *Antiq.* xviii. 5, 2; xx. 6, 2; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 14, 3."—After the banishment of Archelaus (six years after Christ), when Judæa and Samaria were conjoined with the province of Syria, the government of Palestine was administered by a procurator. This governor of Palestine generally resided at Cæsarea, by the sea; but during the Passover he was in Jerusalem, whither the male population of the whole country flocked, and where it was his duty not only to preserve order, but also the prestige of the Roman power. If the presidents of Syria were in Palestine, they, of course, exercised sovereignty in the country. In regard to succession of the procurators, which was interrupted by the reign of Herod Agrippa from 41–44, *see* Winer, art. *Procurator*, and K. von Raumer's *Palestine*, p. 338 et seq.

Ver. 3. **Then Judas . . . when he saw.**—He might readily learn that Jesus had been condemned. But he also *saw* it, from the procession in which the Pharisees conducted Jesus to Pilate, which could have no other object than to secure His condemnation.—**Repented himself (regretted, felt sorrow, remorse).***—This repentance was not genuine, as *occasioned* by the consequences of his deed, but false, as *caused* by these consequences, and these alone. It seems, then, that he had not anticipated such an issue. This circumstance has frequently been adduced in support of the idea, that the object of Judas in betraying the Lord had been to induce Him to display His majesty and glory as the Messiah. But in that case we would have expected that his repentance would lead him now to cling to Jesus. Yet he seems to have expected that, as on former occasions, so now, Jesus would miraculously deliver Himself from the power of His enemies; and that in any case he would have his own honor promoted by the turn things would take (*see* above). Moreover, by the very fact, that after His betrayal Jesus surrendered Himself unto death, Judas was filled with terror and anguish, seeing in this the fulfilment of Christ's prediction, and an indication that all His

* [Comp. Crit. Note on ver. 3, p. 501.—P. S.]

other sayings, notably that concerning His betrayer, would also be fulfilled. Reckoning in his own mean way, Judas expected an ordinary result; and the fact that all his anticipations proved so utterly false, and the issue proved so entirely extraordinary, filled his mind with awe.

And brought back the thirty pieces of silver.—The way of spurious penitence in contradistinction to the genuine repentance of Peter. His first disposition is to attempt some outward rectification of his deed in the sight of men, without previous humiliation before God, and seeking of refuge with Him. In connection with this, it is also a question whether he did not also entertain the hope of a still higher reward for his betrayal. The second stage and feature is expressed in the word ἀνεχώρησε, the force of which is too little understood [and not adequately rendered in our authorized version by "he *departed*"]. It conveys to us the idea that "he retired or withdrew" into solitude—desolation, a desert place—"and went away thence and hanged himself."—The third stage was that of absolute despair. The precise time when Judas brought back the thirty pieces of silver is not mentioned. But from the circumstance that Matthew connects it with the leading away of Jesus unto Pilate, we infer that he approached the priests and elders during the time of their appeal to the Roman governor, and the transactions connected with it. We can readily conceive that many opportunities for this may have offered, when they were not otherwise engaged, as, for example, during the examination before Herod.

Ver. 4. **I (have) erred.***—Luther translates ἥμαρτον here: I have *done* (*did*) *evil;* de Wette [as the authorized Engl. Version]: I have *sinned.* The word bears either construction. Accordingly, we prefer rendering it, I (have) *erred*, which seems to express the mind and the views of Judas more fully. The desire to make his guilt appear as *small* as possible is also evident from the explanation which he offers of his conduct.—**In that I betrayed innocent blood,** *i. e.*, that by my betrayal I have caused the bloody death of one who is innocent. This admission may be taken as a grand testimony in favor of the innocence of Jesus, which must be added to that of Pilate, and to the indirect testimony of the Sanhedrin itself, which could prefer no other accusation against Jesus than that He had designated Himself the Messiah and the Son of God. If Judas could have recalled any circumstance, however trifling, which might have cast a shadow upon the Lord, we may readily believe he would gladly have appeased his conscience in that manner. Still this declaration about *innocent blood* cannot in any way be construed into the testimony of a penitent disciple. It seems to us that, in his remorse and anguish, Judas, with his carnal millennarian views, would now view Jesus in the light of an innocent enthusiast. The balance of evidence is strongly against the reading αἷμα δίκαιον.

What is it to us? see thou to it!—Bengel: *Impii in facto consortes post factum deserunt.*

Ver. 5. **In the temple.**—Meyer rightly calls attention to the distinct and definite meaning of the expression. "It is neither *beside the temple* (Kypke), nor in the council-chamber, Gazith (Grotius), nor is it equivalent to ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ (Fritzsche and others); but—as the term ναός always implies, and in the sense which every reader must attach to the preposition ἐν—in the *temple-building, i. e.*, in the *holy place* where the priests were. Thither Judas now cast the pieces of silver. In his despair, he had penetrated where priests alone were allowed to enter." If, as seems probable, this took place on the morning of Christ's death, we can readily understand how he found the temple empty, and thus was able to cast down the money in the sanctuary, as a testimony against the hierarchy. "There lay that blood-money, the price of the betrayal of innocent blood, from which the field was called, *The field of blood*—a testimony against Israel." Hengstenberg, *Christologie*, iii. 2, p. 464.

And he withdrew himself (anchorite-like into solitude), **and went away hence.**—We have here not one movement of Judas, but two: the verb ἀνεχώρησε is separated and distinguished by καί from ἀπελθών, and the latter indicates the going away from the deed, which had been designated by ἀνεχώρησε. From the locality where his suicide took place, we may infer that he had first attempted to retire from the world, and to lead a life of penitence as an anchorite in the valley of Gehinnom. But his despair allowed him no rest, and he committed that awful deed which the religion and the history of his people (Saul, Ahithophel) alike condemned.

And hanged or strangled himself.—Meyer (following de Wette) observes: "We must not be led by the statement in Acts i. 18 to attach any other than its *primary* meaning to the word ἀπάγχομαι (such as, he was consumed by anguish of conscience, Grotius, Hammond, Heinsius, etc.), as the only one which accords with the simple historical narrative. To reconcile the difference, it is generally assumed, that after having hanged himself, Judas fell down headlong. In that case, Matthew would simply have recorded one part, and Luke the other, of his sad end (thus Kuinoel, Fritzsche, Olshausen, etc.). This cutting in pieces of the narrative, is, however, not only arbitrary, but unsupported by Acts i. 18, which does not even explicitly record the fact of a suicide," etc. Accordingly, Meyer supposes that there were two different traditions about the end of the betrayer, the relative historical value of which cannot be exactly determined, bearing to the end that "Judas had met with a violent and fearful death, in a manner which tradition variously represented as suicide by hanging (Matthew), or as falling headlong and bursting asunder in the midst (Acts i. 18), or finally, as a swelling of the body, and crushing by carts and wagons (Papias according to Œcum.)." In considering this question, we must, in the first place, avoid being confused by the apocryphal legend. (*See* the passage in Winer, art. *Judas*, Note 4.) Next, we must bear in mind the different point from which Matthew here, and Peter in Acts i. view the same event. Matthew simply records the successive stages of Judas's despair, terminating in suicide by hanging himself. Peter, on the other hand, views the death of Judas as the condign reward of a wicked part, in opposition to the part of the apostleship which he was to have obtained. Viewed in this light, Judas had first voluntarily gotten the reward of iniquity, and ultimately (involuntarily) a field, upon which he fell dying, all his bowels gushing out. That the words of Peter do not mean that Judas had purchased a field with the thirty pieces of silver, appears from the rhetorical character of his address, in which he assumes a knowledge of the facts of the case, and by the explanatory clause, added to the words: he purchased—*and fall*

* [So Dr. Lange translates in his Version: *Ich habe gefehlt.* *See* the Critical Note on ver. 4, p. 501.—P. S.]

ing headlong, etc. The expression, "*purchased*," or gained for himself, is ironical, with special reference to the circumstance that he hanged himself in the field which was afterward purchased for the thirty pieces of silver. Accordingly, we adopt the view so vividly sketched by Casaubonus. That writer suggests that Judas (according to Matthew) hanged himself over a precipice in the valley of Gehinnom. The branch broke, or the rope was torn, and Judas (according to the report of Peter) fell down headlong and burst asunder. Winer, indeed, carpingly objects, that the effects described by Peter could in that case only have resulted if the body had fallen on jagged pieces of rock. But we may safely leave a criticism which is driven into difficulties in search of rocks, among the rocky valleys around Jerusalem.

Ver. 6. **It is not lawful.**—Wetstein: *Argumento ducto ex Deut.* xiii. 18. *Sanhedr.* fol. 112.—Thus unconsciously condemning their own hypocrisy who had paid this same price of blood.

Ver. 7. **And they took counsel**;—*i. e.*, resolved in council. No doubt this took place *after* the crucifixion, although soon afterward.—**And bought the potter's field.**—Evidently a well-known place. A field used for potteries would, of course, be a waste and comparatively valueless spot.—**To bury strangers in.**—The expression does not refer to Jews from other countries (as Meyer supposes), who in a religious point of view were not strangers, nor to professing heathens, who were left to themselves, but to Gentile proselytes (of the gate), to whom a certain regard was due, while priestly exclusiveness would not allow them to repose in properly consecrated graves. Thus, even in this act of cheap charity and pious provision on the part of a Sanhedrin which slew the Lord of glory, Pharisaism remained true to itself. The price of blood and the field of blood are declared quite suited for "strangers." The field of blood, or *Aceldama* (Acts i. 19), is on the steep face of the southern hill, opposite Mount Zion, which bounds the valley of Ben Hinnom. Tradition points out the spot. "In a corner where some graves or natural caves, in a semi-dilapidated condition, are found, is the Aceldama or field of blood of tradition. In support of the accuracy of this view, I may state, that above it there is a considerable *stratum* of white clay, where I repeatedly observed people working. Eusebius and Jerome are the first who mention the tradition in the Onomasticon. This place of sepulture, which till the fourteenth century belonged to the Latins, became afterward the property of the Armenians. Probably it ceased to be used for interments since the last century, although it is impossible exactly to determine the date. A large vaulted sepulchre in a rock, or rather a cave, served to indicate the locality of the field of blood." Krafft, *Topogr. of Jerus.*, p. 193.—The field of blood adjoins "the Hill of Evil Counsel," where Caiaphas, according to tradition, possessed a country house, in which the death of Jesus had been resolved upon (Matt. xxvi. 3). Braune confounds this with the Hill of Offence, on the southern top of the Mount of Olives. In the Middle Ages it was believed that the soil of the Aceldama had the power of consuming bodies in one, or at least in a few days. Accordingly, shiploads of it were, during the thirteenth century, transported to the *Campo Santo* at Pisa.

Ver. 9. **That which was spoken by Jeremiah the prophet.**—De Wette observes: "Neither this nor any similar passage is found in Jeremiah. Accordingly, some Codd. and Versions omit these words. But a similar passage occurs in Zech. xi. 12. Hence Cod. 22, Syr. p. in m. read Ζαχαρίου. But even Origen, Eusebius, Jerome, and Augustine found the common reading, which, in fairness, cannot be disputed. Origen, *Homil.* 35, supposes that the passage is found in an apocryphal book of Jeremiah. Jerome found the passage in an apocryphal writing of Jeremiah, which a Nazarene showed him, but he thought it was borrowed from Zechariah. To us it seems probable that the Evangelist has been misled by the statement in Jer. xviii. 2, to name that prophet instead of Zechariah. The quotation from Zechariah is freely made, the phraseology being different both from the Hebrew text and from the *Sept.*" The following are various attempts at removing the difficulty: 1. It was a mistake of memory (Augustine)*; 2. the reading "Jeremiah" is spurious (Rupert von Deutz, etc.); 3. it occurred in a work of Jeremiah which has been lost (Origen, etc.); 4. it was an oral statement of that prophet (Calovius, etc.); 5. the Jews have expunged the passage from the book of Jeremiah (Eusebius). "If the passage has been found in an Arabic book, or in a Sahidic or Coptic lectionary, these must be regarded as interpolations from our passage." Meyer.†—In reference to the above, we remark,—1. That it is very improbable our Evangelist should have confounded the prophecies of Zechariah—with which he evidently was quite familiar, quoting without naming them, as in xxi. 5; xxvi. 31—with those of Jeremiah. 2. It seems impossible to identify the passage before us with Jer. xviii. 2, since it contains no reference to a purchase on the part of the prophet. 3. On the other hand, however, we find a connection between the quotation of Matthew and Jer. xxxii. 8, especially ver. 14: "Thus saith Jehovah of hosts, the God of Israel, Take these evidences [letters], this evidence of the purchase which is sealed, and this evidence which is open, and put them in an earthen vessel, that they may continue many days. For thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel, *Houses, and fields, and vineyards, shall be possessed* [in German, *purchased*] *again in this land*." These words must be taken along with ver. 8, where *the Lord commanded* the prophet to act in this manner. These words are now paraphrased by the Evangelist, in connection with materials furnished by *Zechariah and by Jewish history*, so as to exhibit the πλήρωσις of what the prophet intended to convey, viz., that the boldest purchase should yet be made, by which the price set upon the Messiah would be given for a potter's field to be a burying-place for pious pilgrims. The meaning of the quotation is as follows: At the command of the Lord, Jeremiah bought a field at Anathoth, at a time when Jerusalem seemed to be in the hands of the king of Babylon, in order thereby symbolically to express the idea that Jerusalem was

* [Adopted by Alford: "The citation is probably quoted from memory and inaccurately." He refers to similar mistakes in the apology of Stephen, Acts vii. 4, 16, and in Mark ii. 26. Wordsworth cuts the Gordian knot in a manner directly opposite, though equally unsatisfactory, viz.: by the bold dogmatic assertion that the name of Jeremiah is here purposely substituted for that of Zechariah to teach us that all prophecies proceed from *one* Spirit, and that the prophets are merely channels, not sources, of the Divine truth. But this object could have been reached much better by substituting the *Holy Spirit* or the *Scripture* for the name of the writer.—P. S.]

† [Dr. Lange might have added a sixth attempt to solve the difficulty, viz.: that the book of Jeremiah, being actually arranged by the Jews as the first of all the prophets (*Baba Bathra*), gave its name to the whole body of their writings. So Lightfoot and Scrivener.—P. S.]

still a place of hope, and that it had a blessed future in store. Thus unconsciously had the Sanhedrin, by its purchase of the potter's field as a burying-place for strangers, symbolically and prophetically expressed the idea that Jerusalem was yet destined to be the place of pilgrimage of countless worshippers. Thus they unconsciously prophesied, as Caiaphas did, according to John xi. 50; and thus had they fulfilled the prediction of Jeremiah (vers. 15, 43, 44). 4. The Evangelist sums up in a brief sentence the grand thought of Jeremiah (as he had done in ii. 23), referring in it to Zech. xi. 12, *without, however, quoting that passage*. There the typical Shepherd of the people of God (who is the same as Jehovah himself) has His price fixed by His sheep. They give it as thirty pieces of silver, the well-known price of a slave. Jehovah says: "Cast it to the potter, אֶל־הַיּוֹצֵר: a goodly price that I was prized at by them." (On the meaning of these obscure words, comp. the author's "*Leben Jesu*," ii. 3, p. 1494.) The *Sept.* adds, by way of explanation, "to the melting-pot." (An anomalous explanation by Hitzig, mentioned by Meyer, who thinks he finds in it a rectification of the *Sept.* and the punctuation of the text.) This is to imply that the money was impure, and required to be melted over again. 5. Matthew also distinctly alludes to Gen. xxxvii. 28—the purchase-money of Joseph when sold by his brethren. 6. Accordingly, the passage in question combines four different quotations: (*a*) "And they took the thirty pieces of silver," which is derived from the narrative, with a special reference to Zechariah; (*b*) "the price of Him that was valued"—also after Zechariah; (*c*) "whom they bought of the children of Israel" [as in the margin of the authorized version]—after Gen. xxxvii; (*d*) "and gave them for the potter's field"—the narrative of the text, with a special reference to Zechariah; (*e*) "*as the Lord appointed to me*"—*the key of the whole passage, quoted from Jer.* xxxii. 6, 8. They gave the whole price for which they bought and sold the Saviour for a potter's field, to serve as a place of burial for believing Gentile pilgrims. Thus, while sealing their own doom, they have unconsciously made Jerusalem a city of the future—but of a future which shall bring advantage to believing Gentile pilgrims—they have purchased for them a resting-place in death.

Ver. 9. **Of Him that was valued** or **priced,** τοῦ τετιμημένου.—Meyer thinks that "the expression is intended to give the Hebrew הַיְקָר (*pretii*). But the Evangelist evidently read הַיָּקָר (*cari, æstimati*), and applies it to Jesus as the valued One κατ' ἐξοχήν; Euthym. Zigabenus: τοῦ παντίμου Χριστοῦ, comp. Theophylact, and of late Ewald: the invaluably valuable One, who nevertheless was valued at so low a price." This view implies not only that Matthew had intended closely to follow Zechariah, but that he had at the same time misunderstood and misrepresented him. It attaches to the verb τιμάω a twofold and a contradictory sense. The meaning of the words really is: "of Him that was valued"—the sense favored by most critics, including de Wette and Hofmann. Nor is there any tautology about it, as the words ὃν ἐτιμήσαντο ἀπό mean: whom by valuing they purchased, or, whom they bought. Thus the expression, "of Him that was valued," would seem specially to refer to the passage in Zechariah—the priests being the subject of the verb ἐτιμήσαντο.—**Whom they bought of the children of Israel** (= Jacob).—This does not mean that Christ had been valued by the whole people (Hofmann); nor, at the instigation of the children of Israel (Meyer); nor, from among the children of Israel, *i. e.*, for a man of Israel (Baumgarten-Crusius); but, bought from the children of Israel (Castellio, Luther, and others). Judas is here the representative of the whole treacherous nation; and the passage alludes to the sons of Jacob, who sold Joseph.—**For the potter's field,** εἰς τόν,—for the purchase thereof. The allusion here to Zech. xi. 13 is very slight. The passage in the prophet, "Cast it אֶל־הַיּוֹצֵר" (and that, as appears from the sequel, in the temple), is rendered by the *Sept.* εἰς τὸ χωνευτήριον, to the melting furnace. Hitzig proposes to read אוֹצָר, the treasure, hence, Cast it into the temple-treasury. But, irrespective of the fact, that this is merely an arbitrary conjecture, it would give a wrong meaning, as the small price was to be treated with contempt, not with honor and distinction. Hengstenberg explains it: Cast it to the potter = the executioner. But these two terms are certainly not identical. The potter forms the vessels for the temple, and puts the old into new forms. Accordingly, we conjecture that in the court of the temple, where the various vessels were arranged, there was a place bearing the inscription "*To the potter*," which was equivalent to "*the melting furnace*." Into this receptacle, designated by its inscription, Jehovah directs the thirty pieces of silver to be cast.—Thus "to the old iron" cast the price, according to which they have valued Him as equal with "old iron." Gerlach regards the thirty pieces of silver as the hire of a shepherd for a year. But it is well known to have been the price for a slave.—**As the Lord appointed to me.**—Referring not to the passage in Zechariah, but to the narrative of Jeremiah referred to, that the Lord had commanded him, by way of symbol, to purchase the field at Anathoth.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. ON THE CHARACTER OF JUDAS, *see* our previous remarks. For more detailed treatises about his call to the apostolate, comp. Heubner, *Comment.* p. 418. On the defence set up for Judas by a section of the Gnostics and of the Menonites, and by some modern writers, *see* Heubner, p. 420.

2. THE REPENTANCE OF JUDAS.—Terrible and mysterious as is the guilt, so awful and sad is the repentance of the traitor, as it ultimately terminates in the blackness of despair. The ancients were wont to place it side by side with the penitence of Cain, as the counterpart of true repentance. Thus much is evident, that from first to last his penitence was unhealthy and godless. For its source and origin was not his guilt, but the consequences resulting from it ("when Judas *saw that*," etc.). Secondly, in its course and progress it did not appear as repentance toward God, in the economy of salvation. We see him seeking first to offer human satisfaction before the priests; next, retiring as a penitent into solitude; and lastly, casting himself, in his suicide, headlong into the abyss of despair. We note the opposite of all this in Peter. Here we have first bitter weeping, repentance toward God, and return to Christ; and then human satisfaction, offered in the strength of the pardoned soul and in newness of life. Lastly, there is the sad termination in the case of Judas,—his repentance being the sorrow of the world, which worketh death (2 Cor. vii. 10). At the outset, he wants the

genuineness and sincerity in dealing with an offended God which constitutes the grand characteristic of true repentance; during the course of it, that faith which flies for refuge to the sovereign mercy of God, who is able and willing to pardon; and hence, in the end, the victory of hope and love over despair. Heubner remarks: "When the conscience of a sinner awakens and fills him with terror he is hopelessly lost if he lose faith—faith in the grace of God, who is able and willing to pardon, and faith in an atoning and all-sufficient Saviour. Hence it is absolutely necessary to keep firm hold of faith." However, ingenuousness and truth are the condition of ability to believe. He that doeth the truth cometh to the light. The same writer remarks: "Satan has two arts by which he seduces men. Before we sin he cries out: *Spera!* and after we have sinned: *Despera!*" (*See* the quotation from Luther, *Works*, vol. xix. 1498.)

3. Suicide: Saul, Ahithophel, Judas.—"Suicide, if not freely and voluntarily committed, but arising from physical disturbance, may expect pardon from God." In his "*Table-talk*," Luther expressly says (Walch's edition, ch. xlviii. § 13, p. 1039), "that all cases of suicide are not condemned." (Which may be added to Stäudlin's *History of the opinions on Suicide*, p. 116.) Heubner: "When suicide is committed freely, and with full consciousness and reflection, it is always the result of sinful estrangement and alienation from the Creator, and of despair in everlasting love. True, it is very generally also the consequence of gross sins which torment the soul, and of violent passions. These alone, however, do not lead men to their eternal downfall; it is unbelief alone. Hence it is that suicides are now so much more common."—What makes suicide at once detestable and horrifying is, in the first place, the false and wicked combination of the most extreme contradictions,—self-love and self-abandonment, deliverance and destruction, healing and murder, rebellion against God and forth-stepping to His judgment-bar; in the second place, the fact that the self-murderer perverts to his own destruction that moment which God had appointed to be the crisis of his perfected salvation (*see* Acts xvi. 27); in the third place, the circumstance that the self-murderer, regardless of consequences, anticipates and neutralizes, in a cowardly and wicked manner, the act of free surrender of the soul to God in death, which is its highest spiritual form (*see* the author's *Positive Dogmatik*, p. 1243). Suicide is, so to speak, the theatrical exhibition and full development of sin's self-destructive nature, and is the natural type of eternal self-condemnation. Truth accordingly must never in its testimony cease to war against suicide, regarded in itself; she cannot compromise with it, but must ever condemn it as the evidence of despairing unbelief. But as suicide is often the result of bodily and mental weakness, the twin child of madness, we should deal with actual cases in a forbearing, mild, and cautious spirit. We should act similarly in those cases where remorse in after-life leads to suicide, though that act appears to be merely the natural consequence of the preceding heinous crime committed by the miserable persons. The spiritual suicide of Judas was consummated in the moment of his treachery against his Lord and Master. Heubner's statement: "We may fall ever so low, if we only hold fast the faith," is as liable to misconception as many similar remarks of Luther. Faith is ethical in its very nature, and cannot be separated from moral laws. Upon other points connected with suicide, consult the Systems of Ethics. We should not return to the confessional, because the reserve of ungodly men and their brooding lead them to self-destruction; but we should, throughout the Evangelical Church, recommend the practice of a free confession of heart.

4. Appropriation of the Blood-Money.—"Hypocritical conscientiousness. Their scruples arose from Deut. xxiii. 18:—'Thou shalt not bring the hire of a whore, or the price of a dog, into the house of the Lord thy God for any vow; for even both these are an abomination unto the Lord thy God.' The instruments of the wicked are a source of disgust and dread to them, especially those to whom the stain of blood attaches as a memorial of their guilt. They are agents to awaken conscience, and threaten punishment. These wretches suffered blood to stain their hands and lie upon their consciences, but they would not allow the temple treasury to be defiled. The money-chest they valued above their conscience. They would not transgress by receiving defiled money, for they feared to render their treasury valueless: this was their reverence for God (Matt. xxiii. 24). There is a proper solicitude, however, which we should all have, to keep our property undefiled."—"They appropriated the money to a charitable purpose; but it is impossible to remove the guilt and disgrace of former days by acts of mercy." Heubner. Similar institutions were common in the Middle Ages. The cloister of Königsfelden in Switzerland was the fruit of Queen Agnes' bloody vengeance.

5. The Field of Blood.—Even in the acts of charity performed by the Sanhedrin, the characteristic traits of its members come to view; the most complete hypocrisy, making the money-chest of God's house more sacred than God Himself and God's acre.* They purchase for a paltry sum, and that the price of blood, a field of blood, to inter pious pilgrims from heathen nations, who were not reckoned to be fully Jewish proselytes. So the charity of the Middle Ages sought out beggars upon whom to expend its kind offices, and these it furnished with beggars' broth. Unconsciously, these hypocrites were compelled to perpetuate the memory of their sinful acts; and in this act, besides, was given unconsciously a plastic type of the Sanhedrin. Without willing it, they had to fulfil Jeremiah's prophecy. The purchase of the potter's field to be a resting-place for foreign pilgrims becomes prophetical of this, that Jerusalem, Palestine, and Israel's entire inheritance, was destined to be a resting-place for the believing Gentile world.

6. Here for the first time Christian grave-yards took the place of isolated sepulchres, as was the custom among the Jews. And who was probably the first interred in that field? This history preaches mildness and tenderness.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The counsel and the treachery on the morning of the feast. 1. The counsel and treachery: (*a*) An act of treachery from a resolution of council; (*b*) a counsel which was perfected by an act of treachery. 2. On the morning of the feast: (*a*) The morning thought; (*b*) the festival thought, of the rulers of

* [*Gottesacker*, also *Friedhof*, is the German name for *grave-yard*.—P. S.]

Israel.—The abominable display of the high-priest and the chief council on the festal morning.—Christ's murder disguised under an imposing act of worship rendered to God.—The great display of fanaticism, in its historic import to the world.—Blessed are they who can resist the currents of the time.—The mad pomp with which the Jews abandon their long-looked-for King to the Gentiles.—Judaism in the act of involving the Gentile world in the guilt of Christ's murder: the opposite of the promise: "In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed," Isa. liii.—The effects of magnificent display: 1. Its power; 2. its weakness.—Jesus abandoned by His own nation to the Gentiles.—The second betrayal the sentence of death pronounced upon the first betrayal (*Now when Judas saw*).—The repentance of Judas the completion of his guilt, as seen: 1. In its beginning; 2. its means; 3. its end.—The repentance of Judas compared with Peter's, 2 Cor. vii. 10.—To render due satisfaction, we must begin at God's throne.—(Against Thee only have I sinned.) Ezek. xxxiii. 15, 16.—That innocent blood, which he had betrayed, would have saved him, had he known its full value.—Judas's testimony to the innocence of Jesus a significant fruit of his discipleship: 1. The spoiled fruit of a reprobate or deserter; 2. the important testimony of a deserter.—The unwilling testimony of the unbelieving and despairing to the glory Jesus.—Behold how heartlessly the wicked abandon the instruments of their guilt! "*See thou to that.*"—The confession of a bleeding conscience is unheard by the hierarchical superintendents of the confessional.—How soon is the friendship of the wicked at an end!—They hurl one another mutually into destruction.—The fruitless attempts of Judas to silence his conscience.—The end of Judas; or, suicide the sign of finished unbelief.—The conscientious scruples of the unscrupulous: "*It is not lawful.*"—The charitable institutions of a hardness of heart which cloaks itself under the garb of piety: 1. Their occasion,—the committal of a crime; 2. their spring,—superstition and selfishness; 3. their form,—monuments of a proud, unloving spirit.—The price at which the world valued Christ sufficed to purchase an old, exhausted clay-pit ("loam-pit or sandhole").—The fulfilment of the prophet's word; or, the burying-ground of pious pilgrims—*i. e.*, of believers—bought with the purchase money of Jesus.—The field of blood of despairing Judaism converted into a burial-field (*a field of peace*) for the believing Gentile world.—They who delivered Christ over to the Gentiles have had to yield their land likewise to the Gentiles.

Starke:—We should be up early, not to injure our neighbor, but to praise God, Ps. cviii. 2, 3, and to attend honestly to our calling, Ps. civ. 23.—*Zeisius*: Christ has been bound that He might free us from the bonds of sin, death, the devil, and hell.—He also thereby sanctified and blessed the bonds of our afflictions, especially those endured for the gospel.—*Canstein*: Satan blinds the eyes to precipitate man into sin; and then he opens them again, that despair may seize the sinner.—Do not be such a fool as to commit a sin to gain the world's favor; for it will draw its head out of the noose, and leave thee to be hanged.—*Quesnel*: There is a kind of hirelings and false shepherds, to whom it is of no consequence whether their sheep stray and are lost or not.—*Zeisius*: Do but see how far greed will lead a man.—*Canstein*: The anguish of an evil conscience deprives a man of his judgment, so that he is no more his own master; for when he thinks by self-murder to free himself from torment, he only plunges himself into eternal torment.—Thou canst find many a companion in sin; but when thy poor conscience will have comfort, thou art forsaken by them all.—Hast thou sinned deeply, despair not; arise, and repent truly.—*Nova Bibl. Tub.*: Christ has given the grave-money for our burial, and has purchased for us, poor pilgrims who have nothing of our own, a resting-place.—*Canstein*: The wicked themselves must assist in establishing divine truth.

Gossner:—"See thou to that:" such is their absolution.

Gerlach:—It was a remarkable circumstance in the passion history of Christ, that He must be delivered up to the Gentiles. Not the Jews only were to reject and crucify the Son of God, but the Gentiles also; and His blood crieth for mercy on behalf of Jews as well as Gentiles.

Heubner:—The witness of Judas. He was the spy whom Satan had been permitted to place among the confidential friends; he was Satan's appointed fault-finder, who should pay attention to discover any fault that might be committed. But he had to confess he had betrayed innocent blood.—That Judas might have gained pardon, if he had believed, is acknowledged by, *e. g.*, Chrysostom, in Sermon 1 on Repentance, and by Leo the Great, in the 11th Sermon on the Passion.—Even the most glorious opportunities of virtue and religion, even the companionship and conversation of the most holy and most lovable of men, are perverted to its own ruin by a corrupted spirit.—An evil germ, small at first, but nourished and tended, produces fruits ever more and more poisonous.—They care for the bodies of dead foreigners, but let the souls of the living perish.—The perpetuation of sinful acts through memorials, names, etc., against the will and expectation of evildoers.—How are the children of God, yea, Christ Himself, valued in this world! To how many are philosophers, artists, heroes, or millionnaires far more precious!

Braune:—Common minds become small criminals, great characters great criminals, as men judge: the former are base, the latter more wicked. (Still the deed of Judas was the very depth of baseness.)—He seeks to clear himself only before his own conscience and his accomplices, not before God, and that he would do without Jesus. He wanted faith, and hence he prayed not and sought not.—Themselves they have stained, God's treasury they would not defile.—*Schulz*: The end of Judas: 1. His despair; 2. his ruin.

[BURKITT:—Behold! a disciple, an apostle, first a traitor, then a self-murderer. Behold! all ye covetous worldlings, to what the love of that accursed idol has brought this wretched apostle. Behold! Judas, once shining in the robes of a glorious profession, now shining in the flames of God's eternal wrath and vengeance. Lord! how earnest ought we to be for thy preserving grace, when neither the presence, the miracles, the sermons, the sacraments of Christ, could preserve and secure a professor, a disciple and apostle from ruinous apostasy. *Let him that standeth take heed lest he fall.*—DODDRIDGE:—The irresistible force of conscience in the worst of men.—The testimony of the traitor to the innocence of Jesus.—The wrath of man shall praise the Lord.—D. BROWN:—The true character of repentance is determined neither by its sincerity nor by its bitterness, but by the views under which it is wrought. Judas, under the sense of his guilt, had nothing to fall back

upon; Peter turned toward Jesus, who was able and willing to forgive. In the one case we have natural principles working themselves out to deadly effect; in the other, we see grace working repentance unto salvation. — WORDSWORTH:—Judas, a type of the Jews, in his sin and end (?).—P. S.]

NINTH SECTION.

JESUS, THE KING OF THE JEWS, BEFORE PILATE'S BAR; OR, CHRIST EXAMINED BY THE CIVIL AUTHORITY; INSULTINGLY PUT BESIDE BARABBAS; STILL MORE INSULTINGLY REJECTED, AND, IN SPITE OF THE MOST DECISIVE PROOFS OF HIS INNOCENCE, CONDEMNED, DELIVERED TO BE CRUCIFIED, MOCKED.

CHAPTER XXVII. 11-31.

(Mark xv. 2-20; Luke xxiii. 2-25; John xviii. 28-xix. 16.)

11 And Jesus stood [was placed][1] before the governor: and the governor asked [questioned][2] him, saying, Art thou the King of the Jews? And Jesus said unto him, Thou
12 sayest [it].[3] And when he was accused of [by] the chief priests and [the] elders, he
13 answered nothing. Then said Pilate unto him, Hearest thou not how many things
14 [what things, πόσα][4] they witness against thee? And he answered him to never a word [and he answered him not a word];[5] insomuch [so] that the governor marvelled
15 [wondered] greatly. Now at *that* [the] feast[6] the governor was wont to release unto
16 the people a prisoner, whom they would. And they had then a notable [notorious,
17 ἐπίσημον][7] prisoner, called Barabbas.[8] Therefore when they were gathered together, Pilate said unto them, Whom will ye that I release unto you? Barabbas,[8] or Jesus
18 which [who] is called Christ? For he knew that for envy they had delivered him.
19 When he was set down on the judgment seat, his wife sent unto him, saying, Have thou nothing to do with that just man: for I have suffered many things [much] this day in a dream because of him.
20 But the chief priests and elders persuaded the multitude that they should ask [for]
21 Barabbas, and [should] destroy Jesus. The governor answered and said unto them, Whether of the twain [Which of the two] will ye that I release unto you? They
22 said, Barabbas. Pilate said unto them, What shall I do then with Jesus which [who]
23 is called Christ? *They* all say unto him,[9] Let him be crucified. And the governor said, Why, what evil hath he done? But they cried out the more, saying, Let him be crucified.
24 When Pilate saw that he could prevail [avail] nothing,[10] but *that* rather a tumult was [is] made, he took water, and washed *his* hands before the multitude, saying, I am
25 innocent of the blood of this just person:[11] see ye *to it*. Then answered all the people,
26 and said, His blood *be* on us, and on our children. Then released he Barabbas unto them: and when he had scourged Jesus, he [but Jesus he scourged and, τὸν δὲ Ἰησοῦν
27 φραγελλώσας] delivered *him* to be crucified. Then the soldiers of the governor took Jesus into the common hall [Prætorium],[12] and gathered unto him the whole band *of*
28, 29 *soldiers*.[13] And they stripped him,[14] and put on him a scarlet robe. And when they had platted a crown of thorns, they put *it* upon his head, and a reed in his right hand:[15] and they bowed the knee before him, and mocked him, saying, Hail, King of
30 the Jews! And they spit upon him, and took the reed, and smote him on the head.
31 And after that they had mocked him, they took the robe off from him, and put his own raiment on him, and led him away to crucify *him*.

[1] Ver. 11.—Lachmann and Tischendorf read ἐστάθη [for ἔστη], according to B., C., L., [also Cod. Sinait., which generally agrees with Cod. Vaticanus. Meyer and Alford regard ἐστάθη as a correction to suit the sense better.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 11.—['Επερώτησεν is "a part of the formal judicial inquisition;" hence, *questioned*.—P. S.]

[3] Ver. 11.—[So Coverdale and Conant, who insert *it*. Others insert *right* or *truly*. Σὺ λέγεις, like σὺ εἶπας in ch. xxvi. 25, is a form of affirmative answer, common in Rabbinic writers (*solennis affirmantium apud Judæos formula*, as Schöttgen says); the object of the verb being implied.—P. S.]

[4] Ver. 13.—[So Dr. Lange: *welche Dinge*. Also Dr. Conant, who refers the word πόσα, *quantus, how great*, not so much to the *number* of the offences charged upon Him, as to their magnitude; and in this sense the reader naturally understands the word *what* in this connection.—P. S.]

[5] Ver. 14.—[Coverdale renders πρὸς οὐδὲ ἓν ῥῆμα: *not one word;* Conant: *not even to one word;* Lange: *nicht auf irgend ein Wort;* Meyer: *auf nicht einmal ein einziges Wort*, *i. e.*, not even to one inquisitorial question.—P. S.]

[6] Ver. 15.—[*At the feast*, at every passover. *See Exeg. Notes.*—P. S.]

[7] Ver. 16.—[The word ἐπίσημος is here used in a bad sense, as in Joseph. *Antiq.* v. 7, 1, and Euripides, *Orest.* 249; hence, *notorious* (Rheinish Version, Symonds, Norton), or *famous* (Wiclif, Campbell, Scrivener), or *noted* (Conant); in German: *berüchtigt* (de Wette, Lange, etc.). The term *notable*, which dates from Tyndale, and was retained by Cranmer, the Genevan, and the Authorized Version, is now generally employed in a good sense. The Latin Vulgate, however, translates: *insignis*, and Ewald: *berühmt*.—P. S.]

[8] Vers. 16 and 17.—Fritzsche and Tischendorf read Ἰησοῦν Βαραββᾶν, following some cursive Codd., the Syriac and other versions, and Origen. Meyer thinks the sacred name was left out through reverence. De Wette supports this reading. [In his large critical edition of 1859 Tischendorf omits Ἰησοῦν, and defends the usual reading: *see* his critical note. So also Alford, who thinks that some ignorant scribe, unwilling to ascribe to Barabbas the epithet ἐπίσημος, wrote in the margin Ἰησοῦν. This is doubtful. The insertion cannot be satisfactorily explained, and I am disposed to agree with Meyer, that Ἰησοῦς is genuine. It makes the contrast still more striking.—P. S.]

[9] Ver. 22.—The αὐτῷ of the *Recepta*, according to the best testimonies, is to be omitted.

[10] Ver. 24.—[The older English Versions and Campbell take ὅτι οὐδὲν ὠφελεῖ personally. So also Alford, the Latin Vulgate, the German Versions, Lange (*dass er nichts ausrichte*), and Meyer (*dass er nichts nütze*). But Beza, Ewald, Norton, and Conant translate it impersonally = οὐδὲν ὠφελεῖται, *dass es nichts nütze, that it avails nothing*.—P. S.]

[11] Ver. 24.—The words τοῦ δικαίου [before τούτου] are wanting in B., D. But Cod. A. reads: τούτου τοῦ δικαίου. Lachmann puts them in brackets, Tischendorf omits them [so also Alford]. The omission is more difficult to account for than the insertion. [Cod. Sinait. differs here from the Vatican Cod. and sustains the *text. rec.:* τοῦ δικαίου τούτου.—P. S.]

[12] Ver. 27.—[The scourging took place outside of the πραιτώριον, which is the official palace of the Roman Procurator, or *the governor's house*, as the margin of the Authorized Version explains. Comp. Mark xv. 16: ἔσω τῆς αὐλῆς.—P. S.]

[13] Ver. 27.—[The interpolation: *of soldiers*, is a useless repetition. By ὅλην τὴν σπεῖραν is meant the whole cohort (the tenth part of a legion) then on duty at the palace.—P. S.]

[14] Ver. 28.—Several Codd., B., D., etc., read ἐνδύσαντες [*having clothed Him*, for ἐκδύσαντες αὐτόν]. Lachmann adopts it, but regards this reading as an old writing error. [Lachmann's object, it should be remembered, is not to establish the most correct, but the most ancient text attainable, as it stood in the fourth century. Tischendorf and Alford retain ἐκδύσαντες. *See* the *Exeg. Notes.*—P. S.]

[15] Ver. 29.—The best supported reading: ἐν τῇ δεξιᾷ [for the *lect. rec.:* ἐπὶ τὴν δεξιάν] represents the conduct of Christ more passive, and is more suitable. [Cod. Sinait. reads ἐν τῇ δεξιᾷ, and ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς for ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλήν.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

General View.—Matthew describes the sufferings of Christ chiefly from the theocratic point of view. Hence, under the general head of a theocratic reference, we would group the silence of Jesus before Pilate, after He had declared that He was the Messiah; His being put upon an equality with Barabbas; the testimony of the wife of Pilate, and the testimony of Pilate himself (following that of Judas); the cry of the Jews: "His blood," etc.; and the detailed narration of the mocking Christ in His kingly nature, on the part of the soldiers. The events, according to the Evangelists, occurred in the following order:—At first Pilate wished to hand Jesus over to the Jewish court, that is, to receive a simple ecclesiastical censure. Then he sent Jesus to Herod, to get rid of the difficulty. Thereupon occurred the presentation of Christ along with Barabbas, and, after the failure of that device, the significant hand-washing. Then, the presentation of Jesus to the people, after He had been scourged: *Ecce homo.* Finally, the scornful treatment of the Jews by Pilate, designed to veil his own disgrace.*

Ver. 11. **Art Thou the King of the Jews?**—For the circumstances leading Pilate to put this question, *see* John xviii. ver. 29 ff. From the same passage, vers. 34–37, we learn that Jesus, before replying in the affirmative, asked whether Pilate used the expression, *King of the Jews*, in a Roman or a Jewish sense. The chief point for Matthew was, that Jesus, even before Pilate, the civil ruler, declared Himself explicitly to be the Messiah. Theophylact has, without reason, interpreted σὺ λέγεις as an evasive answer.

Ver. 12. **He answered nothing.**—After He had, according to John xviii. 37, declared that He was the Messiah, and in what sense, He made no answer to the most diverse accusations and questions, and spake not till Pilate cast in His teeth the taunt, "Knowest Thou not that I have power to crucify Thee, and have power to release Thee?" John xix. 10. The accusations were by His silence stamped as groundless, and this majesty of silence filled Pilate with wonder and amazement.

Ver. 15. **Now at the feast.**—Annually, at the Passover. The Passover was the Jewish feast κατ' ἐξοχήν, and the connection shows that to this festival reference is here made. The antiquity of this custom is unknown. The Talmud makes no allusion to it; but that is in all likelihood an intentional oversight. Grotius says, this custom was introduced by the Romans for the purpose of flattering the Jews. Braune: "The Roman and Greek custom of releasing prisoners upon the birthdays and festive seasons of the emperors, and upon days of public rejoicing, had been undoubtedly introduced among the Jews before the time of Pilate, to soften the Roman yoke." Meyer: "We must not overlook a reference to the significance of the Passover." Hence our thoughts are carried back to the free escape of the Israelitish

* [In German; "*Schliesslich eine höhnische Behandlung der Juden, die seine* (viz., Pilate's) *Schmach verhüllen sollte.*" Dr. Lange refers evidently to the mockery of the Jews by Pilate related in John xix. 14, 15, 20, 22. The Edinb. edition entirely misunderstands this sentence in translating: "The conclusion of all being the ironical *conduct* of the Jews, as if *they* wished to throw a cloak over *His* indignities." Here the word *Behandlung* was probably mistaken for *Handlung*, and the subject changed.—P. S.]

first-born. Looked at in this light, the release of the prisoners at the Passover reminds us of the Good Friday dramas of southern Roman Catholic countries. The custom, as a Jewish custom, was improper, and was opposed to the law, especially in such a case as the present, Exod. xxi. 12. Barabbas had been arrested for sedition and murder, Luke xxiii. 19.

Ver. 16. **They had then a notorious prisoner.**—The wardens of the jails, in which were confined those who had committed offences against the Roman laws.

Called Barabbas.—Several cursive MSS., versions, scholiasts, and also Origen, read *Jesus Barabbas*. *See* note appended to the text. Barabbas, = בַּר אַבָּא, which appears frequently,. according to Lightfoot, in the Talmud, means "the father's son." Ewald says: "He was the son of a rabbi." Theophylact saw in it an allusion to Antichrist, "the son of the devil." On the contrary, Olshausen makes it refer to the Son of God, and finds in it a play of divine providence, according to the proverb: *Ludit in humanis divina potentia rebus*. De Wette terms this a very improper play of pious wit; and yet he must acknowledge it to be possible that Barabbas, being a mover of sedition (Luke xxiii. 19), might have played the part of a false prophet, or a messiah. The objection, that he would not have committed a murder had he been representing himself as a messiah, is of no weight. Let us now conceive to ourselves the whole state of matters: a Jesus Barabbas, the son of the father, a pseudo-messiah, is presented to the Jews along with Jesus Christ. Surely in all this may easily be seen a striking sport of so-called "chance." And why should the supposition that providence controlled the similarity and difference between the two names, be so senseless? It is conceivable, however, that the Christian tradition removed the name Jesus, out of reverence.

Ver. 17. **When they were gathered together.**—Pilate had by this time discovered how matters stood. In his crooked policy, accordingly, he calculated upon certain success, when he should place the notorious or distinguished criminal side by side with Jesus, for the Jews to choose which of the two should be released. Besides, he appears to have waited cunningly till the people had reassembled in very large numbers before his palace on the Antonia, after having gone and returned with the train which conducted Jesus to Herod. Because, according to Luke, this train had gone off before the events here recorded occurred. Pilate knew by this time how envious the members of the Sanhedrin were of Jesus, and must from this conclude that he stood high in the favor of the people.

Ver. 18. **For envy.**—The Evangelist mentions here, in a historical connection, envy as the cause of all the hostility manifested against Jesus, as if it were something well understood.

Ver. 19. **When he was set down on the judgment-seat.**—The people had a moment for consideration, and Pilate regards the issue as one of such certainty, that he ascends the seat of judgment to receive the decision of the people, and to pronounce judgment accordingly. The judge was required to pronounce judgment from a lofty seat of authority, from his chair of office. This stood usually upon a stone pavement (*Lithostroton*, in Hebrew, *Gabbatha*, John xix. 13).*

His wife sent to him.—This fact is found in Matthew only. As formerly, according to Matthew, the spirit of truth had in visions of the night borne witness for the new-born Jesus, and as the testimony of the heathen magi had in the day-season confirmed this witness, so on this occasion is the solemn, political testimony of Pilate on behalf of the suffering Jesus strengthened by a witness speaking out of the dream-life of his wife. Thus it is that each Evangelist selects out of the store of facts those which accord best with his views and purpose. From the time of Augustus, it became usual for the Roman governors to take their wives along with them into the provinces, though the custom was attacked down till the age of Tiberius: Tacit. *Annal.* iii. 33. Pilate's wife, according to a tradition, given in Niceph. *Hist. Eccles.* i. 30, was called *Claudia Procula* or *Procla*, and was, according to the Gospel by Nicodemus, θεοσεβής, *i. e.*, a proselyte of the gate, and perhaps one who revered Jesus. The Greek Church has canonized her.

Have nothing to do with that just man.—She designates Jesus the *Just*, and hints that Pilate, by injuring Him, may subject himself to the divine punishment.—**For I have suffered much.**—An ordinary dream would not be spoken of in this way, as a dream of bitter agony. Nor would such a dream have led a Roman wife to send a dissuasive message to her husband when seated upon the judgment-seat. Some apparition, something supernatural, awful, must be here understood. Hence many have attributed this dream to a direct interposition of God, especially* Origen, Chrysostom, Augustin; others—namely, Ignatius (*Epist. ad Phil. cap.* 4), Beda, Bernard, also the old Saxon Gospel-Harmony, Heliand—ascribe the dream in a naive way to the devil, who wished in this way to prevent the redeeming death of Jesus. Of course the dream may have arisen quite naturally, as de Wette and Meyer hold. The governor's wife knew something of the mission of Jesus; and the night before, the Sanhedrin had in all probability alarmed the procurator's household, coming to demand a guard. But this view does not militate against divine interposition, although the Evangelist makes no allusion to such intervention. The dream was a morning dream, hence σήμερον,—according to the Roman time-division, from twelve at midnight. Klopstock makes Socrates appear in the dream to the wife of Pilate (in the seventh Song of the *Messias*).

[It is a remarkable fact that a woman, and she a heathen, should be the only human being who had the courage to plead the cause of our Saviour during these dreadful hours when His own disciples forsook Him, and when the fanatical multitude cried out: *Crucify Him, crucify Him!* It is equally remarkable that she should call Him δίκαιος ἐκεῖνος, *that just man*, and thus remind one of the most memorable unconscious prophecy of heathenism, viz., Plato's description of the perfect δίκαιος, who,

* [The Edinb. translation reads: "This stood, *unfortunately*, upon a stone foundation." It is as difficult to see the connection of the German *üblicher Weise* (*usually*) with *unfortunately*, as the connection of misfortune with a stone foundation, unless some one happens to fall on it. It is hardly conceivable that the translator should have derived so plain a word as *üblich*, *customary*, *usual*, from *Uebel*, *evil*, instead of *üben*, *to practise*.—P. S.]

* [Not: *namely*, as the Edinb. translation reads, which uniformly confounds *namentlich* (*especially*) with *nämlich* (*namely*), although in this case the preceding *many* (*viele* in German, for which the Edinb. trsl. substitutes *some*) should have prevented the mistake.—P. S.]

"without doing any wrong, may assume the appearance of the grossest injustice (μηδὲν γὰρ ἀδικῶν δόξαν ἐχέτω τῆς μεγίστης ἀδικίας);" yea, who "shall be scourged, tortured, fettered, deprived of his eyes, and, after having endured all possible sufferings, fastened to a post, must restore again the beginning and prototype of righteousness" (*see* Plato, *Politia*, vol. iv. p. 74 sqq.; ed. Ast, p. 360 sq., ed. Bip., and my *History of the Apostolic Church*, p. 433 sq.). Aristotle, too, says of the perfectly just man, "that he stands so far above the political order and constitution as it exists, that he must break it, wherever he appears." The prophecies of Greek wisdom and the majesty of the Roman law here unite in a Roman lady, the wife of the imperial representative in Jerusalem, to testify to the innocence and mission of Christ. It is very likely that the wife of Pilate was one of those God-fearing heathen women, who, without embracing the Jewish religion, were longing and groping in the dark after the "unknown God."—P. S.]

Ver. 20. **But the chief priests and the elders persuaded.**—The members of the Sanhedrin availed themselves of the delay during which Pilate was occupied in receiving this message, to canvass the people and obtain their support. The two warnings which came, the one from the thoughtful presentiment of a pious spirit to Pilate, the other from the tortured conscience of Judas to the priests—proved fruitless; indeed, the first occasioned only a delay which the enemies of Jesus turned to their account. Nevertheless the testimony of his wife was not wholly lost on Pilate, for it reacted upon his own later solemn testimony.

Ver. 21. **But he answered,** ἀποκριθεὶς δέ.—Meyer properly explains, He replies to these preparations on the part of the Sanhedrin, which he overhears from his chair, by asking the people again, and more definitely: **Which of the two,** etc., and so puts a stop to this canvassing of the priests.

Ver. 22. **Let Him be crucified,** σταυρωθήτω.—They might have asked simply that he would confirm the condemnation for blasphemy, and sentence Jesus to the Jewish mode of execution by stoning; but they go further, and demand his active cooperation in the judgment. They wished Jesus to be executed as an insurrectionist, and hence to be crucified according to the Roman custom. They sought by this extreme penalty and this deepest disgrace to annihilate the memory of Jesus, and to stake the Roman might against faith in Him. Thus, in their senseless, self-destructive fanaticism, they consigned to the Roman cross their own Messianic idea; for the accusation, that Jesus was a mover of sedition, was only an inference which they deduced from the Messianic dignity claimed by Jesus.

Ver. 23. **What evil then hath He done?** Τί γὰρ κακὸν ἐποίησεν;—*then*, γάρ, implies that they must be able to give positive reasons for His death. The Evangelist passes by, however, the further special points, and represents only the effect of the uproar, which threatened to become an insurrection.

Ver. 24. **Washed his hands.**—A symbolical act of Jewish custom (consult Deut. xxi. 6; *Sota*, 8, 6), by which one frees oneself solemnly from guilt. Pilate adopted a Jewish custom, to make himself from their own stand-point fully understood, and probably also to make a final attempt to dissuade them from the course they were pursuing. "The heathen practice of cleansing the hands to clear them from the guilt of murder after it had been committed, might, from its analogy, have led to the adoption of the Jewish custom." Meyer. The matter, however, was important enough to call for a peculiar symbolic expression. [Pilate washed his *hands*, but not his *heart*, and in delivering up Christ, whom he pronounced innocent, he condemned himself. Sense of guilt made him a coward.]

Ver. 25. **His blood be on us.**—That is, the punishment for His death, if He be guiltless. That Matthew is the only one who records this act of self-cursing on the part of the people, cannot throw any doubt upon the truthfulness of the same, when we remember that he wrote for Jewish Christians, and brought, in this declaration, the saddest truth before his nation. The early Christians had reason to see in the speedily following downfall of the Jewish state a fulfilment of this imprecation. [The history of the Jews for these eighteen hundred years is a continued fulfilment of this daring and impious imprecation, this fearful legacy bequeathed by the murderers of Jesus to their posterity. Yet for repenting and believing Jews, this curse is turned into a blessing; the blood of Jesus which cleanseth from all sin, and speaketh better things than that of Abel, comes upon them as a cleansing and healing stream, and may yet come upon this whole race, after the fulness of the Gentiles has been saved, Rom. xi. 25, 26.—P. S.]

Ver. 26. **But Jesus he (caused to be) scourged.***—The Roman scourging, of which mention is here made, was much more severe than the Jewish. According to the latter, only the upper part of the body was bared; according to the former, the entire body. The Jews numbered the lashes (2 Cor. xi. 24); the Romans laid them on without number or mercy. Besides, the Roman scourge was more excruciating. None but slaves were subjected to this flogging, Acts xxii. 25. Little value was attached to a slave's life, much less his feelings. It is a matter of controversy whether bones, iron teeth, or leaden balls, were inserted among the thongs of the lash (*see* Heubner, p. 435). "That such lashes are mentioned, is not to be doubted; one of such a description was called μάστιξ ἀστραγαλωτή, a knout with bones woven to the end of the thongs, from ἀστράγαλος, a joint of the back-bone, then dice, *talus*." The Romans scourged in two different ways. Those who were condemned to be crucified were flogged after one fashion. This scourging was so cruel, that the criminals died frequently while undergoing the punishment. Another kind of scourging was inflicted upon delinquents who were not condemned to capital punishment, for the purpose either of extorting a confession from them, or to punish them for a crime. This was the kind of scourging to which Pilate subjected Jesus. It was no less cruel than the other, inasmuch as it lay entirely in the hands of the judge to declare how far the punishment was to be carried. —*See* Friedlieb, p. 114.—De Wette: "Matthew and Mark represent Jesus as suffering the scourging which the Romans inflicted upon those condemned to the

* [The verb φραγελλόω, which occurs twice in the N. T., here and Mark xv. 15, and the noun φραγέλλιον, which occurs once, John ii. 15, are Latin terms (*flagello*, *flagellum*), introduced into the later Greek for the more usual μαστίζω or μαστιγόω, and μάστιξ or ἱμάς (a *whip*, a *scourge*). Luke (xxiii. 16) uses in this connection the more general term παιδεύσας αὐτόν, *having chastised Him*, John (xix. 1), the more usual word ἐμαστίγωσεν, *scourged Him*.—P. S.]

cross. (Liv. xxxii. 36; Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* v. 11, 1; Hieron. ad Matt. xxvii.*) According to Luke, Pilate merely proposes to punish, that is, to scourge, Jesus, and then release Him; but from his account (xxiii. 16) it would appear that there had been no actual infliction of scourging. From John xix. 1, it seems that Pilate caused Jesus to be really scourged, hoping thus to satisfy the Jews, and to awaken their sympathy. Paulus holds John's account to be the decisive one, and hence falsely explains our passage: *after having already previously caused Him to be scourged.*† Strauss (ii. 525) considers that the Synoptists give the more correct and earlier account." It is manifest that John's narrative is the most exact. The scourging which Pilate inflicted was employed, it would seem, as a punishment of Him whom he considered innocent, in order to satisfy the accusers, and to move them to compassion. It was a police correction, and the right of inflicting it rested upon the right to employ torture. In this sense it was that Pilate had long ere this, according to Luke, proposed to scourge Jesus, hoping by this act to work upon the feelings of the people, and to influence them in their choice between Barabbas and Christ. Hence Luke considers it superfluous to record the later, actual chastisement. Matthew presents the scourging in its significance as an actual fact, which, in his eyes, was the transition from trial to crucifixion, the first act in the crucifixion agonies. He might all the more properly view the scourging in this light, inasmuch as Pilate sought to effect, in his hesitation, a twofold object. At one moment it seemed as though he would himself take the initiative in the crucifixion; again, as though he would craftily overmaster the Jews.—"It was usually lictors that scourged; but Pilate, being only sub-governor, had no command over lictors, and so handed Jesus over to the soldiers. Hence it is probable that Jesus was not beaten with rods, but scourged with twisted thongs of leather." Friedlieb, p. 115. Those who were flogged were tied to a pillar; generally they were bound in a stooping posture to a low block, and so the skin of the naked back was stretched tight, and fully exposed to the fearful lashes. The whips were either rods or thongs, to the ends of which lead or bones were attached, to increase the tension of the lash, and render the blow the more fearful. The backs of the prisoners were completely flayed by this process. They frequently fainted, and sometimes died. The soldiers would not inflict the punishment mildly, for they were the cruel ones who mocked Him afterward. It was, moreover, the policy of Pilate that Jesus should be perfectly disfigured.

Ver. 26. **He delivered Him to be crucified.**—The actual decision succeeded the presentation of Jesus, after His being scourged and crowned with thorns. The history which Matthew gives of these circumstances is quite systematic. The matter was now as good as settled. The form of the sentence was not prescribed, but must be short and valid. It was commonly: *Ibis ad crucem.* By the time these transactions were over, it was already, as John informs us, the sixth hour, toward mid-day.

[By delivering Jesus to the Sanhedrin, Pilate sacrificed his lofty and independent position as a secular judge and representative of the Roman law, to the religious fanaticism of the Jewish hierarchy. The state became a tool in the hands of an apostate and blood-thirsty church. How often has this fact been repeated in the history of religious persecution! By this act Pilate condemned himself, and gave additional force to his previous testimony of the innocence of Christ, showing that this was dictated neither by fear nor favor, but was the involuntary expression of his remaining sense of justice from the judgment-seat.—P. S.]

Ver. 27. **Into the prætorium or governor's house.**—Luther translates πραιτώριον by *Richthaus* (*common hall*). Its original meaning is the tent of the general in the Roman camp: then it came to signify the residence of the provincial ruler (*prætor, proprætor*), where the court of justice likewise was held. The *prætorium* is consequently the residence of a military, or a civil and military magistrate; and hence it is connected with the main guard-house, and equally with the state-prison (Acts xxiii. 35). "Already existing palaces were employed as *prætoria* in the provincial towns; and we see from Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 14, 8, that the procurators of Judæa, when they were in Jerusalem, converted the palace of Herod into a *prætorium.*" Winer. Is it certain, however, that the palace of Herod was always so used? According to tradition, the governor lived in the lower city, and, as some more definitely assert, in the fortress Antonia. Winer is of opinion, that Pilate would find the empty, waste-standing palace of Herod the most convenient residence. But where, in that case, would Herod Antipas, who had come up to the feast, dwell? There is nothing certain to be made out. The following fact, however, speaks in support of the fortress Antonia. The scourging had taken place in front of the *prætorium.* Then Christ was handed over to the soldiers; and they, instead of leading Jesus away immediately, commenced to mock and make a sport of Him. To carry this mockery on undisturbed, they conducted Jesus into the court of the *prætorium.* In this conduct, the soldiers followed the excitement of the capital in its hate against Jesus, continuing the godless sport, which Herod had begun when he invested the Lord in a white robe, the token of candidateship, and so make a mock of His claim to the throne. Pilate had, however, the double design, either to mollify the Jews by the sight of the derided Jesus, or to mock them through Him, should his cunning plan fail.

And gathered unto him the whole band.—This is conclusive for the place being the fortress Antonia: σπεῖρα, the tenth of a legion, from 400 to 600 men.*

* [Jerome says on Matt. xxvii. 26: "*Sciendum est Romanis eum (Pilatum) legibus ministrasse, quibus sancitum est, ut qui crucifigitur, prius flagellis verberetur. Traditus est itaque Jesus militibus verberandus, et illud sacratissimum corpus pectusque Dei capax, flagella secuerunt,*" etc. He then says this was done "that by His stripes we might be healed" (Isa. liii. 5).—P. S.]

† [This sentence, as well as the whole quotation, and the following passage, is entirely mistranslated in the Edinb. edition: "*and so he rejects the statement here contained as false.*" De Wette (on Matt. xxvii. 26) as here quoted by Lange (and correctly quoted), ascribes to Paulus of Heidelberg no denial of the fact of scourging asserted by Matthew, but a false interpretation of φραγελλώσας as expressing an action which occurred at a previous stage according to John xix. 1. He says: "Paulus hält den Bericht des Johannes für maassgebend und erklärt daher unsere Stelle (*i. e.*, Matt. xxvii. 26) falsch: *nachdem er ihn vorher schon hatte geisseln lassen.*" The words in italics are quoted from Paulus. Some commentators assume that Jesus was scourged twice; but this is improbable and unnecessary, as the chronological difficulty can be satisfactorily accounted for in the manner proposed by Dr. Lange in the text.—P. S.]

* [The Edinb. translation magnifies the company to 4,600

Ver. 28. **And they stripped Him.**—Meyer adopts the reading ἐνδύσαντες, *they clothed Him*, and explains that His clothes had been torn off to scourge Him, and were now again put on. But the clothing is silently implied—mention being made here of a new maltreatment. Perhaps they may have first put on again the white dress in which Herod had caused Him to be clothed, to mark Him out as *a candidate for* royal honors, and then taken it off in order to invest Him with the scarlet robe, the sign of His having *attained* to kingly dignity. The drama would thus be complete. They, accordingly, again stripped off His outer garment, and, instead of it, put on a scarlet military cloak, *sagum*, which was intended to represent the imperial purple; "for even kings and emperors wore the *sagum* (only longer and finer)." Meyer. The mantle was a pallium dyed with cochineal. The epithets, *purple*, *purple robe*, used by Mark and John, are explained by the fact, that they had before them the ironical import of the cloak.

Ver. 29. **A crown of thorns.**—It is impossible to settle accurately what particular kind of thorns was employed to crown Jesus. Paulus assumes, without good reason, that the crown was made of blooming branches of the hedge-thorn (Michaelis, of bear's wort). Meyer: "A wreath of young, supple thorn-twigs, with which they would caricature the bay crown, as they did the sceptre by the reed. Their object is not to occasion pain, but to mock." Why *thorns* then? Consult Winer, art. *Dorn*, as to the plentiful supply of thorns in Palestine. Hug considers it was the buckthorn. Braune: Perhaps the crown was made from the supple twigs of the Syrian acacia, which had thorns as long as a finger.

And a reed in His right hand.—John omits this point, from which we might suppose that the reed had not remained in His hand. Probably a so-called Cyprian (we say now Spanish) reed. Sepp, iii. 516. De Wette says, ἀπέθηκαν does not agree with κάλαμον. His ἔθηκαν does not agree, however, with the idea of a hand, which did not need to close on receiving the reed.

And they bowed the knee.—"After they clothed Him, they began their feigned homage, bowing the knee, and greeting, according to the usual form: Hail, King of the Jews!"

[On the symbolical meaning of this mock-adoration, Wordsworth observes: "All these things, done in mockery, were so ordered by God as to have a divine meaning. He (Christ) is clothed in scarlet and purple, for He is a military (?) conqueror and King; He is crowned with thorns, for He has a diadem won by suffering, the diadem of the world; He has a reed in His hand, for He wields a royal sceptre, earned by the weakness of humanity (*see* Phil. ii. 8–11). The cross is laid on His shoulder, for this is the sign of the Son of Man, the trophy of His victory, by which He takes away sin and conquers Satan; His titles are inscribed upon the cross: 'King of the Jews,' for He is the sovereign Lord of Abraham and all his seed. In all these circumstances, as St. Hilary says, He is worshipped while He is mocked. The purple is the dress of royal honor; His crown of victory is woven with thorns. As St. Ambrose says (in Luke xxiii. 11): '*illudentes, adorant.*'"—P. S.]

Ver. 30. **And they spit upon Him.**—Their cruelty, and the intoxication of wickedness, keep them from carrying out to the close the caricature exactly. The satanic mockery changes into brutal maltreatment.

Ver. 31. **And after they had mocked Him.**—And after the presentation to the people, John xix. 5, had taken place,—Pilate's last attempt to deliver Him. After the final decision, they clothed Jesus in His own garments, to lead Him away.

men! The original has "4–600 *Mann*;" the dash being always employed in such cases for *bis, to*. The number of men constituting a Roman legion varied at different times and according to circumstances from 3,000 to 6,000 or more. Consequently a σπεῖρα (*spira*), or *cohort*, which was the tenth part of a legion, embraced from 300 to 600 men or more. In Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* iii. 4, 2, of eighteen σπεῖραι five are said to contain each 1,000 men, and the others 600. But in Polybius ἡ σπεῖρα is only the third part of a cohort, a *maniple, manipulus*. *See* Classical Dictionaries.—P. S.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. Jesus, the longed-for Messiah of the Jews, abandoned by His people to the detested Gentiles. Christ, the desire of the old world, driven out by that old world, as if He were the old arch-enemy. Or, the condemnation of the world converted through His victorious patience into the world's redemption.

2. *Christ before the judgment-seat of Pontius Pilate.*—When He stood before the judgment-seat of Caiaphas, He pronounced in spirit judgment upon the hierarchy of the old world; but in that He Himself bore this condemnation, He atoned for us. So here, standing before Pilate, He represents the judgment of God upon the old world, its civilization and arts; but, on the other had, He takes upon Himself this judgment, and makes an atonement for that world. Here, too, He stood the real judge Himself: here, too, did He suffer Himself to be judged.

3. The hierarchy, the people's uproar (revolution), the secular government, and the soldiery of the old world, are all involved in the common guilt of the maltreatment and execution of Christ, though the degree of their guilt differs.

4. Christ's threefold silence, before Caiaphas, before Herod, and before Pilate, not a silence of contrition because of well-grounded accusations, but an atoning silence of majesty, because of the worthlessness of those courts, which had sunk into the very depths of guilt. In this light, the contrast between the moments of silence and of reply is most significant.

5. On one side, the testimony of Pilate's wife to the Lord stands most closely connected with Pilate's own; but, on the other, is strongly opposed. The pious spirit; the political time-server. "It is by no means unusual to see noble, pious women go along side by side with vain, worldly men, like anxious guardian angels, and in moments most fraught with danger, step in their way, and dissuade them from sin." (From the author's *Leben Jesu*, ii. 3, p. 1517.)

6. *Persuaded the people* (ver. 20).—The members of the Sanhedrin stirred up undoubtedly the fanaticism of the people. They would say, Jesus had been condemned by the orthodox court. Barabbas was, on the contrary, a champion of freedom; that Pilate wished to overthrow their right of choice, their civil rights, their spiritual authority, to persecute the friend of the people, etc. And so Barabbas would be gradually made to appear to the people by the statements of these demons of seduction as a Messiah, and the Messiah a Barabbas.

7. *Crucify Him.*—The State was here dethroned, and made subservient to the Church. Later, again,

it became the slave of the heathen, Roman hierarchy, which hated and persecuted Christianity, till the days of Constantine. Again, the hierarchy of the Middle Ages ruled the State in the persecution of heretics. (Even the Emperor Frederic II. * pronounced sentence of outlawry upon all who were excommunicated from the Church, unless they speedily made their peace with her.) Finally, the reform-detesting hierarchy is seen again and again, in the histories of Roman Catholic states, overriding the civil power. Even at the present day, France, though revolutionized three times, will not suffer a person who has retired from the priesthood to marry. In Austria, a monk can obtain from the civil authorities no defence against a persecution by his superiors, as bitter as the Inquisition of the Middle Ages (at least, it was so till very recently).—The old wound will take long to heal.

8. The crowd of those who cried *Hosanna*, are driven into the background by the crowd crying: *Crucify Him.* Hence contradiction. And yet agreement. The same people. The weakest and most cowardly, who ever swim with the stream, allowed themselves to be borne along with both streams.

9. The self-cursing of the Jewish people, a satanic prediction of the people of the prophets, which was the last evidence and extinction of their prophetic gift. The final prediction of Judaism was a cursing of themselves.

10. Pilate's total want of character over against the perfect character (Heb. i. 3, χαρακτήρ).

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The apparent reconciliation of the Jews and the Gentiles: 1. In its deformity: (*a*) the priests seducers of the worldlings, the Jews seducers of the Gentiles, who hate them; (*b*) the Roman State made to be the executioner of the decrees of that Judaism which it despises and humbles; (*c*) both combined against the king of humanity. 2. The awful results of this reconciliation: (*a*) the rejection of Christ; (*b*) the new separation, which appears even before the crucifixion, and culminates in the Jewish war; (*c*) the downfall of Judaism; (*d*) the heavy guilt and deep uneasiness of the Gentile world. 3. The significant signs in this apparent reconciliation: (*a*) a caricature; but also, (*b*) a presage, though not pattern, of the true reconciliation, which Christ instituted by His death, between Jews and Gentiles, Eph. ii. 14.—The judge of the world before the bar of the old world.—The courageous confession and witness of Christ before Pilate (1 Tim. vi. 13; Rev. i. 5).—The calm consciousness of Christ in His last victorious moments (calm before Caiaphas, Herod, Pilate).—The threefold silence of Christ, a majestic testimony: 1. To the eternal discourse of His life; 2. to the emptiness of His enemies' replies; 3. to His certainty of a different judgment from God.—What were the motives leading Christ one time to speak, again to keep silence, before the judge? 1. He speaks first to preserve His self-consciousness by confession; second, to save His enemies by a great, solemn warning. 2. He makes no reply to the futile, the ambiguous, the confused, which must overthrow itself, confute itself, and reveal its own falsity; above all, He is silent before the unworthy and mean, especially before Herod.—Christ, at the bar of the world, acquitted and yet condemned.—Christ was put to death, not so much in consequence of the condemnation of the civil authority, as in consequence of the hierarchical revolution.—And this revolution was the most disgraceful of all.—Yet was this first year of this disgrace of man made by God's rule to be the first year of man's salvation.—Christ and His surrounding company at His trial: 1. The accusers; 2. His partner in trial, Barabbas; 3. the witnesses (Pilate and his wife); 4. the judge.—Notwithstanding the greatest promise of His release, nothing in the world could save Him, because the world was to be saved through His death.—The three arch-enemies of Christ upon His trial, and His impotent friends: 1. Against Him: (*a*) the envy of the priests; (*b*) the ingratitude of the people; (*c*) the unbelief of Pilate. 2. For Him: (*a*) a witty comparison (with Barabbas); (*b*) a pious dream; (*c*) an ineffective ceremony (washing of the hands).—The full powers of hell, and God's full power to decide and save, were at work in the death of Christ; and yet human freedom was in no respect affected.—The world's judgment of rejection, as concerns Christ, and Christ's judgment of salvation, as concerns the world.—Christ and His accusers, and Barabbas, and Pilate's wife, and Pilate, and the people, and the men of war.—Pilate, the judge of Christ, fallen under judgment. 1. His picture: with full understanding of the circumstances, conscious, warned, anxious, and yet succumbing. 2. The lessons taught by the picture. So fell the ecclesiastical judges of Jesus before him; so will all fall after him who presume to judge the Lord.—*Pilate knew that for envy*, etc.—Envy, which stirred Cain up against pious Abel, reaches its maturity in Christ's crucifixion.—The Wisdom of Solomon, ii. 24: "Through envy of the devil came death into the world."—The Spirit's voice in the night-visions a witness from the Lord: 1. At the birth of Christ; 2. at his death.—The significance of the courtesies of hierarchical pride: 1. A sign that it seeks associates to carry out its enmity against Christ. 2. A mask. It *appears friendly to government, and says:* Christ stirs up the people; *friendly to the people, and says:* The government encroaches on the freedom of election, upon your rights; *friendly to the world, and says:* It is possible to live with Barabbas, but not with Christ.—Barabbas; or the people's misguided selection.—The *Hosanna* and the *Crucify Him:* 1. The contrast: (*a*) the contrast of the two days; (*b*) the contrast of opinions; (*c*) the contrast of the criers. 2. The bond of unity: (*a*) Palm Sunday must lead to Good Friday; (*b*) enthusiasm for the Lord must excite hell's opposition; (*c*) not the same persons, but the same people; and we may suppose some individuals had taken part in both.—Fickleness in the opinions of a people.—Revolution as an instrument used by cunning tyrants, and the powers of darkness.—The instigators of the people in hypocritical attire.—Pilate, frightened by the threat of an insurrection, becomes the murderer of Christ: a lesson to the world for all time.—Pilate washing his hands: 1. A testimony to the Lord; 2. a testimony against himself, against Rome, and against the old world.—*His blood be on us!* or, the impenitent make the blood of atonement their own condemnation.—The marks of the

* [Not: "*Charles the Fifth*," as the Edinb. translation reads; for he belongs no more to the middle ages, but to the modern age, being a contemporary of the Reformation. Dr. Lange means Frederic II., German emperor of the famous house of Hohenstaufen in Würtemberg, who conquered Jerusalem, but quarrelled with Pope Gregory IX., was twice excommunicated by him, and deposed by the council of Lyons, and was supposed to be an unbeliever, although he died reconciled to the Church, A. D. 1250.—P. S.]

Jew ever more and more manifest in the Israelite, as he is putting his Christ to death.—The old curse and the eternal atonement.—The policy which would protect the Lord by evil means, only prepares for Him torment and shame without redress.—What means should Jesus, the world's Saviour, employ, according to the world's wisdom, to preserve His life? 1. An evil custom (the release of a criminal at the Passover); 2. a false title (as one whom the people had begged off and released); 3. an improper joke and comparison (being put side by side with Barabbas); 4. a futile ceremony on the part of the judge (to wash the hands, and, where needed, to lift them).—Pilate, the impotent saviour and deliverer: 1. *In spite* of his perception of what is justice, of the legions, of power, of policy, of haughty authority; 2. and exactly *because* he employed all these to wrest justice.—Then released he Barabbas, but Jesus he caused to be scourged: an old, but ever fresh, picture of the world.—Jesus scourged: 1. Who? The glorious body, the pure soul, the divine spirit. 2. By whom? By barbarism (barbarous, nameless soldiers); by worldly culture and civil power; by the sin of the world and all sinners.—The torture and its midnight history in the world and the Church.—The scourge (knout) is no standard of justice.—The twofold signification of the Lord's scourging: 1. It was to have saved Him; 2. it was the introduction of His death, not only in a literal, but also spiritual sense.—Jesus given over to the wantonness of the soldiery.—The repeated mutilation of the image of Christ in war, and by soldiers.—The mocking of the Lord in His Messianic royal character.—The brightness of heaven with which Christ emerges from all this world's scorn.—The irony of the Spirit and of Divine Providence at the miserable mockery of this world, Ps. ii.—The view of Christ clothed in shame; the cure for all the vanity and pride of the world.—Christ, the true King in the realm of suffering.—So perfected as the King of glory.—*Therefore hath God exalted Him*, etc. *At His name every knee shall bow*, Phil. ii. 9, 10.—The patience of Christ triumphantly sustained: 1. Imperturbable, yet disturbing all; 2. paling all the world's glory in its own glory; 3. supremely edifying, and yet awing.

Starke:—When we stand before godless judges, we must nevertheless answer them and honor them, Rom. xiii. 1.—*He answered nothing.* To atone for our loquacity, which led to the first sin.—The Patient One committed all to God, 1 Pet. ii. 23.—*Hedinger*: Blind judges in matters of faith are not worth answering, Matt. vii. 6.—Christ, even in His silence, worthy of admiration, Isa. liii. 7.—*Osiander*: It is an ill-timed grace, when wicked persons are spared, in such a way that honest and quiet people are brought into danger.—*Luther's margin*: They would sooner have asked the release of the devil, than they would have allowed God's Son to have escaped. This is the case even now, and will ever be.—There are degrees in sinfulness as in holiness, John xix. 11.—*Canstein*: Straightforwardness is best. When we seek to make the truth bend, it usually breaks.—*Quesnel*: More truth is at times found among civil magistrates, than among those persons from whom we had a right to expect more.—A pious heathen is often more compassionate toward a poor sufferer than depraved Christians and priests, Luke x. 32, 33.—Christ was reckoned with the greatest transgressors, and we seek always to be reckoned among the best and most pious, Isa. liii. 12.—Pilate did not act like a wise diplomatist, who might have easily known how far envy will lead a man.—*Canstein*: The most implacable foe is envy, and especially among the members of the so-called "spiritual" profession, Eccles. iv. 4.—*Quesnel*: Many console themselves with the thought, that they appear to the world wholly devoted to the service of justice and truth; but if we watch them closely, we see they are slaves of injustice and envy.—Wives have nothing to do in official concerns, but they may and should warn their husbands.—God warns man before he falls.—*Canstein*: In a corrupted Church, the ministers are ever the most corrupted; and corruption issues forth from them, polluting others, Jer. xxiii. 15.—*Quesnel*: Faithless teachers seduce the people from Christ, and teach them to prefer Barabbas.—*Cramer*: Is that not the Antichrist, which can willingly endure brothels and usurers, etc., but which would expel the gospel, and purge their land from it by fire and sword?—*Hedinger*: The world has ever robbed Christ; it likes Him not.—Murderers, fornicators, adulterers, drunkards, can be tolerated; Christian teaching and living never, John xv. 19.—*Canstein*: Carnal wisdom may lead a man, when he despises conscience, departs from the right path, and betakes himself to by-paths, into such snares as he would have gladly shunned.—Ungrateful man wheels like a weathercock.—Conscience often struggles long, ere a man sins against his better knowledge; but the guilt is so much the greater.—The stubbornness of the wicked is more constant than an intention to act right (arising from worldly reasons).—Pilate's testimony, the most glorious testimony to the innocence of Jesus: 1. Not from favor; 2. a judge's testimony; 3. a testimony of Pilate against himself. *His blood be on us.* They act as if they had a good conscience; but it was mere false, assumed ease (impudence).—The Romans soon made them realize this curse: they still feel it. Yet it will one day cease.—*Luther's margin*: Believers convert this curse into a blessing.—*Zeisius*: Accursed parents, who rashly precipitate their children with themselves into ruin!—The just for the unjust, 1 Pet. iii. 18.—Gaze on, O sinner, *ecce homo!*—*Zeisius* and others against extravagance in dress.*—Christ has borne all manner of shame and contempt, that we may attain to the highest honor.

Gossner: †—Yes, they probably said, Barabbas is a villain, but he is no heretic. He destroyed only bodies, but Jesus of Nazareth destroys souls.—The devil may be sure of this, that the people will blind themselves by a fair show.—Whoso sitteth in an official chair must not regulate his conduct by the cries of the multitude.

Lisco:—Pilate, a natural man of the world: 1. Not insensible to divine influences; 2. but sunk down into the then existing scepticism of the world; 3. bound by worldly considerations of all sorts; 4. making his conscience a sacrifice to circumstances, which are his gods.

Gerlach:—Mocking, they made him king; but it was really by virtue of His humiliation that Jesus received His kingdom.

Heubner:—Christ retained His dignity even in the deepest humiliation, where His claims appeared as madness or fanaticism.—The custom of releasing

* [In the original: "*wider die Kleiderpracht*," which the Edinb. edition turns into: "*upon the clothing of Jesus*."—P. S.]

† [Gossner was originally a Roman Catholic priest, and suffered much persecution for his evangelical opinions.—P. S.]

one: injustice trying to support itself by injustice.—A Christian wife should be the guardian angel of her husband.—Dreams, too, often deserve attention.—How easily can the people be misled! *—The placing of Jesus side by side with Barabbas is one of the mysteries of His humiliation. So is it often in the world: there, truth and falsehood, innocence and guilt, honor and dishonesty, worth and worthlessness, righteous leaders and seducers, the Prince of Peace and the great rebel, the fountain of life and the murderer, are often set side by side. The future will resolve all this confusion.—Innocence is dumb, guilt cries out.—*The consequences of the choice:* The Barabbas spirit, the devilish, the intoxicating passion for licentious freedom, entered like an evil spirit into the people, inflamed their hatred still more and more against the Romans, swept them with resistless sway beyond all prudence, and precipitated them at last into the pit of destruction. This spirit has entered into their posterity, leading them still to reject Jesus, and give heed to many false messiahs.—Jesus is our consolation, whenever in this world of imperfection the worthy and unworthy are classed together, yea, the former subordinated to the latter.—Such a choice as that of Barabbas is by no means uncommon: 1. In respect of faith; unbelief instead of belief in Jesus, etc. 2. In regard to our lives and acts; rather an unbridled, unfettered life, than a stern, moral regulation and life. 3. As regards civil government; rather obey demagogues than the soft words of Jesus. — *What shall I do, etc.?* Many know not what to do with Jesus.—Was the adage true here: *vox populi, vox Dei?*—In one sense do the people demand the crucifixion: God had decreed it in another.—The name of Pilate is preserved among the Christians, but as a name of disgrace: here, and in the Apostles' Creed, it is the name of a coward, who wished to release Jesus, and yet surrendered Him,—who knew Him in some degree, and yet feared to confess Him. —*His blood.*, Already we see the fruit of their choice of Barabbas: blind presumption, blasphemy, mockery of God's justice.—If the Jews were not so blinded, they must see clearly that their fathers had committed a greater sin than had been ever perpetrated, when they had been punished before with a captivity of 70 years, and are now enduring one of 1800. —God has preserved them as a witness to the truth of the gospel.—As Christ's high-priestly (prophetic) dignity had been mocked before the ecclesiastical tribunal, so was His kingly before the civil.

Rambach:—Thou must, my Redeemer, atone for the shame of my nakedness, and regain for me the robe of innocence which I had lost.—Consolation for derided saints.—Christ fled from a worldly crown; He took the thorny crown, to indicate that His kingdom was not of this world.—It is no true love, which is not willing to endure thorns.—The thorns of love are: hostile opposition, ingratitude, derision, insult. —The crown of thorns which we have plaited for ourselves: lusts, earthly cares, pangs of conscience. Christ has made atonement for this.—The rod with which Christ will feed His sheep (the rod of gentleness, the rod of affliction).—The court of justice, the liberty-hall of innocence, converted into a place of injustice.—This robing of Christ was full of shame and disgrace.

Braune:—The third hour was the hour at which the Roman judge took his seat in the place of judgment: on this occasion Pilate is forced to begin three hours earlier, in consequence of the wrath of the priests, and their feigned piety.—Barabbas: that is a horrifying deception, fearful, surpassing all others.—Pilate's wife: no woman was found among Jesus' enemies. The maid who forced Peter on to his denial stands alone there, in her forward character.—Peter's sermon on this text, Acts iii. 13–21.

Grammlich:—Daily is blessing or curse (Christ or Barabbas) set before thee, my soul!

F. W. Krummacher:—The crown of thorns calls for repentance, gratitude, submission.

[Burkitt:—Vers. 11–14. The silence of Christ is to be imitated when our reputation is concerned; the confession of Christ, when the glory of God and the interests of truth are at stake.—*He knew that for envy they had delivered Him* (ver. 18). As covetousness sold Christ, so envy delivered Him. Envy is a killing and murdering passion. *Envy slayeth the silly one*, Job v. 2.—Ver. 19. Several kinds of dreams, natural, moral, diabolical, and divine. That of the wife of Pilate was from God. When all Christ's disciples were fled from Him, when none of His friends durst speak a word for Him, God raises up a woman, a stranger, a pagan, to give evidence of His innocency. At our Saviour's trial, Pilate and his wife, though Gentiles, are the only ones who plead for Christ and pronounce Him righteous, whilst His own countrymen, the Jews, thirst after His innocent blood.—Hypocrites within the visible Church may be guilty of acts of wickedness which the conscience of pagans and infidels protests against.—Ver. 25. What the Jews with a wicked mind put up as a direful imprecation, we may with a pious mind offer up to God as an humble petition: Lord, let Thy Son's blood, not in the guilt and punishment, but in the efficacy and merit of it, be upon us and upon our posterity after us, for evermore.—Thomas Scott:—If Christ were now to appear on earth *in disguise*, He would meet with no better treatment.—There are still enough of hypocritical Pharisees and high-priests, ungodly Pilates, unstable multitudes, and hardened scoffers, to persecute, mock, and crucify the Lord, of glory.—Barabbas is preferred to Jesus whenever the offer of salvation is rejected.—We are all chargeable with the guilt of crucifixion, as "He was wounded for our transgressions."—All who delight in anathemas and imprecations will find that they rebound upon themselves.—All which has been admired in the suffering and death of heroes and philosophers is no more comparable to the conduct of Christ, than the glimmering taper is to the clear light of day.—We are called *to do good*, and *to suffer evil*, in this present world, after the pattern of Christ.—All our sufferings are light and trivial compared with His.—Ph. Doddridge:—How wisely was it ordained by divine Providence that Pilate should be obliged thus to acquit Christ, even while he condemned Him; and to pronounce Him a righteous person

* [In German: "*Wie ist das Volk so verführbar!*" The Edinb. edition turns this again into the opposite meaning: "How *misleading* are the masses." It probably confounded *verführbar* with *verführerisch*. But the connection plainly shows that the Jewish hierarchy are here meant as the instigators and seducers who led the people astray. The masses never lead, but are generally under the control of a few, as the body is ruled by the head. Hence the *vox populi* is not always the *vox Dei*, but, when influenced by political demagogues or apostate priests, it is the *vox Diaboli*. Witness the *Crucify Him* of the Jews, the popular outcry of the Athenians against Socrates, the mad fury of the French during the reign of terror, etc. Then the people are turned into a lawless mob with which it would be vain to reason, although it can be intimidated by brute force. Yet even in such cases the voice of the people is overruled for good by an all-wise Providence. So the crucifixion of Jesus became the salvation of the world.—*P. S.*]

in the same breath with which he doomed Him to the death of a malefactor! And how lamentably does the power of worldly interest over conscience appear, when, after all the convictions of his own mind, as well as the admonitions of his wife, he yet gave Him up to popular fury! O Pilate, how ingloriously hast thou fallen in the defence of the Son of God! and how justly did God afterward leave thee to perish by the resentment of that people whom thou wast now so studious to oblige!—P. S.]

TENTH SECTION.

GOLGOTHA: THE CRUCIFIXION. (GOOD FRIDAY.)

Chapter XXVII. 32–56.

(Mark xv. 21–41; Luke xxiii. 26–56; John xix. 17–30; Isa. liii.—Pericopes: Matt. xxvii. 33–38; 39–44; 45–56.)

32 And as they came out, they found a man of Cyrene, Simon by name: him they
33 compelled [impressed, ἠγγάρευσαν][1] to bear his cross. And when they were come unto
34 a place called Golgotha,[2] that is to say, a [the] place of a skull,[3] They gave him vine-
gar [wine ?][4] to drink mingled with gall: and when he had tasted *thereof*, he would not
35 drink. And they crucified him, and parted [divided, διεμερίσαντο] his garments, cast-
ing lots: [that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet (Ps. xxii. 15),
They parted [divided] my garments among them, and upon my vesture did they cast
36, 37 lots.][5] And sitting down they watched him there; And [they] set up over his
head his accusation written, THIS IS JESUS THE KING OF THE JEWS.
38 Then were there [are] two thieves [robbers, λῃσταί] crucified with him; one on
39 the right hand, and another on the left. And they that passed by reviled him, wagging
40 [shaking][6] their heads, And saying, Thou that destroyest the temple, and buildest *it* in
41 three days, save thyself. If thou be the Son of God, come down from the cross. Like-
42 wise also the chief priests mocking *him*, with the scribes and elders, said, He saved
others; himself he cannot save. If he be [he is] the King of Israel,[7] let him now come
43 down from the cross, and we will believe him [we believe on him].[8] He trusted in
God; let him deliver him now, if he will have him: for he said, I am the Son of God.
44 The thieves [robbers] also, which [who] were crucified with him, cast the same in his
teeth [reproached him in like manner, or with the same thing, τὸ αὐτὸ . . . ὠνείδι-
ζον αὐτόν].[9]
45 Now from the sixth hour there was darkness over all the land unto the ninth hour.
46 And about the ninth hour Jesus cried [cried out, ἀνεβόησεν] with a loud voice, saying,
Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani? (Ps. xxii. 1) that is to say, My God, my God, why hast
47 thou forsaken me?[10] Some of them that stood there, when they heard *that* [hearing it],
48 said, This *man* calleth for Elias [Elijah]. And straightway one of them ran, and took
49 a sponge, and filled *it* with vinegar, and put *it* on a reed, and gave him to drink. [But]
The rest said, Let be [Come, Wait, ἄφες],[11] let us see whether Elias [Elijah] will come
to save him.[12]
50 [And] Jesus, when he had cried again with a loud voice, yielded up the ghost [his
51 spirit].[13] And, behold, the vail of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bot-
tom; and the earth did quake [quaked], and the rocks rent [were rent, ἐσχίσθησαν];
52 And the graves were opened; and many bodies of the saints which [who] slept arose,
53 And came out of the graves after his resurrection, and went into the holy city, and ap-
peared unto many.
54 Now when the centurion, and they that were with him, watching Jesus, saw the
earthquake, and those things that were done, they feared greatly, saying, Truly this
55 was the [a] Son of God [Θεοῦ υἱός]. And many women were there beholding afar off,
56 which [who] followed Jesus from Galilee, ministering unto him: Among which [whom]
was Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James and Joses, and the mother of
Zebedee's children [the sons of Zebedee].

[1] Ver. 32.—[This is the proper translation of the Greek verb ἀγγαρεύειν, which, like the noun ἄγγαρος, *a mounted courier*, is of Persian origin, and is a technical term for pressing horses or men into public service by authority. Comp. Crit. Note on ch. v. 41, p. 118. The escort was under the command of a Roman officer who had official authority for this act according to Roman law. The Authorized Version makes the act falsely appear as an arbitrary assumption of power.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 33.—Γολγοθά is the prevailing reading. [Other readings are γολλγοθά, γολγοθθά, γολγοθᾶν, γολγαθᾶν. In Luke xxiii. 33 the English Version, following the Vulgate, translated the Greek κρανίον, *cranium*, *a bare skull*, into the Latin *calvary* (*calvaria*). The popular expression "*Mount* Calvary" is not warranted by any statement of the Evangelists concerning the place of crucifixion, which was probably a small round and barren elevation of the shape of a skull. —P. S.]

[3] Ver. 33.—Lachmann: ὅ ἐστιν κρανίου τόπος λεγόμενος. The reading ὅ is better supported than ὅς, and few MSS. omit λεγόμενος. Great variety in the readings. [In English κρανίου τόπος should be rendered either with the definite article: *the place of a skull*, as the Authorized Version does in the parallel passages, Mark xv. 22 and John xix. 17, or without any article: *Place of a skull*.—P. S.]

[4] Ver. 34.—Lachmann reads οἶνον, following B., D., K., L., etc.: this is opposed by A. and others, reading ὄξος. Meyer holds the first reading to have been introduced from Mark xv. 23. [Cod. Sinait. reads likewise οἶνον, *wine*, as in Mark xv. 23. But the five uncial (Sinait., B., D., K., L.) and the ten cursive MSS., which support this reading, are nearly all Alexandrine. On their side are the Egyptian and the old Latin Versions (the Vulgate: *vinum*, and hence the Roman Catholic Versions: *wine*). It is possible that οἶνον was a wilful alteration to harmonize Matthew with Mark. Tischendorf and Alford adhere to the received reading: ὄξος, *vinegar*. The difference, of course, is only apparent. It was probably sour wine with myrrh, given to criminals to stupefy them.—P. S.]

[5] Ver. 35.—All the uncial Codd. [including Cod. Sinait.] omit the reading of the *Recepta*, from "that it might" to the end of the verse, Δ alone excepted. It is supposed to have been interpolated from John xix. 20. [Mill and Wetstein, and all the modern critical editors omit the words in question from ἵνα to κλῆρον. Dr. Lange puts them in brackets. Comp. his *Exeg. Notes*.—P. S.]

[6] Ver. 39.—[So Cheke, Campbell, and Scrivener render κινοῦντες. Lange: *schüttelten*. Norton: *nodding*. Conant, however, defends *wagging* as better expressing the contemptuous, scornful motion intended by the Evangelist.—P. S.]

[7] Ver. 42.—Βασιλεὺς 'Ισραὴλ ἐστιν. Fritzsche and Tischendorf adopt this reading, omitting the preceding εἰ, according to B., D., L., etc. The irony is thus stronger. Εἰ is probably an exegetical addition from ver. 40.

[8] Ver. 42.—The reading: πιστεύομεν αὐτῷ, according to Lachmann and his authorities, is stronger [than the *text. rec.*: πιστεύσομεν αὐτῷ]. The reading: ἐπ' αὐτῷ, also, is well supported and significant. [Cod. Sinait. reads: ἐπ' αὐτόν. —P. S.]

[9] Ver. 44.—[Or: *upbraided* or *were upbraiding*, Wiclif, Cheke, Doddridge, Campbell, Scrivener; or *reproached*, Rhemish Version, Conant, and N. T. of the Am. B. U.; or *reviled him*, Norton. The rendering: *cast in his teeth*, dates from Tyndale, and was retained in the following revisions, but would hardly be defended now.—P. S.]

[10] Ver. 46.—The difference in the mode of writing the Hebrew words is unimportant. *See* Lachmann and Tischendorf. [The best authorities are in favor of *lema* instead of *lama*.—P. S.]

[11] Ver. 49.—[This is, in modern English, the corresponding word for ἄφες, which must be connected with the following ἴδωμεν without comma. It is the hortatory *come* or *wait now*, and not, as is usually supposed, a rebuke: *let him alone*, as if they intended to stop the man who offered the vinegar. Comp. Mark xv. 36, where that person himself utters the words ἄφες ἴδωμεν, in common with the rest. Lange: *Lass nur, wir wollen sehen;* Luther: *Halt, lass sehen;* van Ess: *Wart! lass sehen;* Ewald omits it altogether and translates simply: *lass uns sehen*. Conant and the Revised N. T. of the Am. Bible Union: *Let alone*, which invites the same popular misunderstanding as if it meant: *Let him* alone.— P. S.]

[12] Ver. 49.—The addition: ἄλλος δὲ λαβὼν λόγχην, κ.τ.λ., though supported by B., C., L., is here quite out of place, and is an interpolation from John xix. 34. [The same addition, from ἄλλος to αἷμα, is found in Cod. Sinait., which usually agrees with the Vatican MS.—P. S.]

[13] Ver. 50.—[So Middleton, Campbell, Scrivener, Crosby, Conant. Better than *expired*, as Norton translates. The article in τὸ πνεῦμα is employed as a possessive pronoun. *To give up the ghost*, is now used in a low sense.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Survey.—The same brevity and sublimity with which Matthew described Christ's sufferings during His trial, characterize his account of the crucifixion. Even Mark, in several parts, is more minute. Matthew, however, gives the fullest account of the blasphemy against Christ's Messianic dignity; and he alone relates the effect produced upon the realm of the dead by the death of Jesus. The chief points are, Simon of Cyrene; Golgotha; the bitter wine; the parting of the garments; the watch (this last is recorded by our Evangelist alone); the two robbers crucified with Jesus; the blasphemies of the foes; the mocking by the robbers; the darkening of the sun; Jesus' exclamation, My God, and the varying interpretations and the real meaning of the same; the giving up of His spirit; the rending of the temple-vail; the excitement in the world of the dead; the centurion's testimony; the women beholding. The fulfilment of the Old Testament symbols of the Messiah's sufferings is the point of view from which all is described.

Ver. 32. **As they came out.**—The executions took place outside of the camp, and, accordingly, also outside of the holy city: Num. xv. 35; 1 Kings xxi. 13; Acts vii. 56; *see* Lightfoot, p. 499. Instead of being led forth by lictors, the command of whom Pilate, as sub-governor, did not enjoy, Jesus is conducted to the cross by the soldiery. A centurion on horseback, called by Tacitus *exactor mortis*, by Seneca, *centurio supplicio præpositus*, headed the company. A herald, going in front of the condemned, proclaimed his sentence. Braune states: "There is a Jewish tradition to the effect that a herald went through the city, crying for forty days, Jesus was to be stoned: if any one could witness against Him, let him appear; but no one came forward." We know from Matt. xxviii. 11, that the Jews began very early to throw discredit upon the statements of the Evangelists. These falsifications were, at a later date, attempted especially in relation to the history of Jesus' birth and death, and regarding the Messianic predictions of the Old Testament. The statement, moreover, of the Talmud, that there were *two* vails before the Most Holy, is evidently a concoction to remove the significance of the fact attested by the Evangelists.

They found a man of Cyrene.—Simon was

from Cyrene, in African Libya, where many Jews were living. Ptolemæus Lagi, when he obtained supreme power in Palestine, transported 100,000 Hebrews to Pentapolis, in that district. They had a synagogue of their own in Jerusalem. It is noteworthy, that we find in Acts xiii. 1, a *Simon Niger* associated with *Lucius of Cyrene.* Mark (xv. 21) designates Simon "*the father of Alexander and Rufus*," two men who must have been well known to the Christian churches of that day, probably as brethren in the faith. Perhaps Simon was present as a pilgrim at the Passover (Acts ii. 10); at all events, he was but lately come to Jerusalem, as his appellation, Κυρηναῖος, indicates. It is not likely that he was at that time more intimately related to Jesus. He had been out in the field, while Jesus was undergoing His trials before the various tribunals. Grotius and others, however, assume that he was a follower of Jesus. Rambach: "He manifested, it would appear, some sympathy with Jesus, and was therefore compelled to carry His cross." Perhaps, during his bearing the cross, he became more intimately acquainted with Jesus; at all events, this fact has preserved his name in everlasting remembrance.* Simon Peter was not now, as he had promised, in his place: another Simon from a distant land must serve in his place. The very circumstance of Simon's arriving, a stranger and alone, at this time, drew the attention of the company; and they forced him, that is, they required of him, according to military custom, this service. For the verb ἀγγαρεύειν, *see* above, Matt. v. 41. Upon such requisitions, *see* Tholuck, *Credibility of the Gospel History* (German), p. 365. Simon may have been thus violently impressed by excited soldiers without being a Christian (Grotius), or a slave (Meyer's supposition). Tradition reports that Christ had sunk to the ground beneath the load. It is possible that the captain of the band, who at a later period declared his conversion to the faith, was even now touched by a feeling of pity. The remainder of the way, it would appear, was short; and this is likely the reason why John omits the circumstance. According to custom, criminals were obliged to carry their own cross to the place of execution. [Comp. Plutarch, *De sera numinis vindicta*, c. 9: ἕκαστος τῶν κακούργων ἐκφέρει τὸν αὑτοῦ σταυρόν. That our Saviour bore His own cross (probably the greater part of the way), is expressly stated by John xix. 17.—P. S.]

Ver. 33. **Golgotha.**—Chald. גֻּלְגַּלְתָּא, Heb. גֻּלְגֹּלֶת, that is, *Skull.* Hieronymus and others say this place of execution was so termed from the skulls of criminals.† On the contrary, it is maintained by Cyril, Calovius, de Wette, and others, that the name arose from the *conical shape* of the hill.* Certainly, for the second supposition, two reasons present themselves,—1. That Golgotha means *skull*, and that the place is not called κρανίων τόπος, place of *skulls*, but κρανίου, *skull*,—Luke uses κρανίον; 2. that the skulls were not allowed to lie upon the place of execution unburied, but were covered up. The tradition of the Fathers, that Adam was buried there, gives us no assistance in explaining the name. Against the second supposition, the late origin of the name, which is not found in the Old Testament, comes in. If now we think of the Jewish mode of execution, stoning, in which the head was the first part injured, we gain something to support the first explanation.† It would appear that Golgotha had not been selected as a place of execution till a late date; and that then the valley of Gehinnom ceased to be employed in that way. It is not unlikely that, up till this time, the place had been nameless, and now received this designation, and, it is possible, by way of reference to its shape.

The Christian tradition has made the position of Golgotha, which was certainly no hill, but merely an elevated place, to be that of "Mount" Calvary, the site of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. This church lies within the walls of the present city, and in the north-western quarter. In opposition to this view, it is alleged that, without making any mention of the line of the city walls, which may belong to a later date, the city would have been in this part exceedingly small, if we suppose the present district of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre to have lain outside the walls. But, in reply, it is asserted, that a city may easily be small in some quarters, and extend in others. The fact is, Jerusalem then ran out more toward the south side. Against this identity the following have spoken decidedly:—ROBINSON (*Biblical Researches*, Bost. ed. 1856, vol. i. p. 407–418; vol. iii. 254–263; and *Neue Untersuchungen*, Halle, 1847); TITUS TOBLER: *Golgotha*, St. Gallen, 1851, p. 224 ff.‡ For the identity are—

* [Meyer: "That Simon *became* a Christian in consequence of his carrying the cross and his presence at the crucifixion, may be inferred from Mark xv. 21." So also Alford and others.—P. S.]

† [Hieron. in Matt. xxvii. 33: "GOLGOTHA, QUOD EST CALVARIÆ LOCUS. *Audivi quemdam exposuisse Calvariæ locum in quo sepultus est Adam, et ideo sic appellatum esse, quia ibi antiqui hominis sit conditum caput.* . . . *Favorabilis interpretatio et mulcens aurem populi, nec tamen vera. Extra urbem enim et foras portam loca sunt in quibus truncantur capita damnatorum, et Calvariæ, i. e., decollatorum sumsere nomen.*"—The ancient Jewish-Christian tradition that Adam was buried where the second Adam died and rose again, is also mentioned by Origen, Tertullian, Athanasius, and Augustine, and turned to practical account. Augustine: "*Quia ibi erectus sit medicus, ubi jacebat ægrotus.*" Dr. Wordsworth allegorizes on Golgotha (from גָּלַל, *volvit*, hence a *rolling*, and a *skull* from its roundness), and brings it in connection with the hill *Gilgal*, Josh. v. 9, where Joshua had his camp and *rolled* away (גַּלּוֹתִי) the reproach of Egypt. So by our Jesus at Golgotha the shame and guilt of sin was *rolled away* from the Israel of God; and there was His *camp*, for He conquered by the cross. Rather far fetched.—P. S.]

* [So also Reland, *Palest.* p. 860, Bengel, Winer, Ewald, Meyer, A. Alexander. The objection of Alford and Wordsworth, that no such hill or rock is known to have existed (comp. Stanley, *Palestine*, p. 454), is hardly valid in view of the hilly and rocky character of Jerusalem and its vicinity. Ewald identifies it with "the hill Gareb," Jer. xxxi. 39; Krafft and Lange with Goath, which was without the city. Williams (*Holy City*, ii. 240) supposes that the rock of Calvary was part of a little swell of the ground forming a somewhat abrupt brow on the west and south sides, which would afford a convenient spot for public execution, as it was sufficiently elevated to raise the sufferers above the gazing crowd.—P. S.]

† [This is hardly of sufficient account. The explanation of Jerome appears to me very doubtful for three reasons: 1. The name would then be not the place of *a skull* (τόπος κρανίου), still less a *skull* simply, as in the Hebrew and in the Greek of St. Luke (κρανίον), but the place of *skulls* (τόπος κρανίων); 2. there is no record that the Jews had a special place for public execution; 3. it is extremely unlikely that a rich man, like Joseph of Arimathea, should have kept a garden in such a place (for the sepulchre of Christ was near the place of crucifixion, John xix. 41).—P. S.]

‡ [Also JOHN WILSON, BARCLAY, BONAR, STEWART, ARNOLD, MEYER, EWALD, SAM. J. ANDREWS: *The Life of our Lord upon the Earth*, New York, 1863, p. 560 sqq., and ARNOLD, art. in Herzog's *Encyklopädie*, vol. v. 307 ff., where the reader will find a summary of the principal arguments on both sides of the question with special reference to Robinson and Williams, as the chief champions of the opposite

KARL VON RAUMER: *Palästina*, p. 355; SCHOLZ: *de Golgathæ situ*, compare FRIEDLIEB: l. c. p. 137; SCHUBERT [*Reise in das Morgenland*, vol. ii. p. 503 ff.]; SCHULTZ: *Jerusalem*, p. 96; KRAFFT: *die Topographie Jerusalems*, Bonn, 1846, p. 230.* WOLFF: *Reise in das gelobte Land*, Stuttgart, 1849, p. 83, pronounces in favor of the probability of the identity (more undecidedly in his work "*Jerusalem*," Leipzig, 1857.) BERGGREN is decided for the identity, in the tract, *Flavius Josephus, der Führer und Irrführer der Pilger im Alten und Neuen Jerusalem*, Leipzig, 1854:—"It may be quite indifferent to a Christian where the place of execution, Golgotha, and Christ's grave, were, inasmuch as the truth of the Gospel history is not dependent upon the traditions regarding the external and local circumstances in the life and death of Jesus. But, overlooking the fact that tradition is often worthy of attention, there are all possible positive reasons to bring forward, why we should seek Golgotha at once, and only there, where the tradition represents. Neither the old world nor the new has any ground for doubting the common opinion regarding the Holy Sepulchre."

The following remark appears important:—Jeremiah predicts (xxxi. 38–40) that the city should in future times extend beyond the north wall (the second wall), and enclose Gibeat Gareb, or the leper's hill, and Gibeat Goath,* or the hill of death (of roaring, groaning). The position of Gareb can correspond only with Under Bezetha, and the position of Goath only Upper Bezetha, where Golgotha rose. Both of these elevations were enclosed by Agrippa, as parts of the new city, and lay inside the third wall. From the context we learn that Gareb and Goath were unclean places, but, being measured in with the holy city, became sanctified. That the Goath-hill of Jeremiah is identical with the Golgotha of the Evangelists, is more than probable. The wall of Agrippa was built around Bezetha by Herod Agrippa, the grandson of Herod the Great.

In conducting this controversy, the following points should be kept in mind: 1. That those who oppose the identity have never pointed out any other site for Golgotha. 2. The history of the city of Jerusalem. It has been proved that the city, at a later period, extended considerably from south northward and north-westward, and that the third wall, or wall of Agrippa, enclosed on this side a piece of ground which had hitherto lain outside the city. 3. The history of the holy places themselves. It has never been disproved, that, according to the testimonies of Eusebius and Hieronymus, a marble statue of Venus desecrated Golgotha from the days of Hadrian to those of Constantine, to prevent Christians from resorting to the holy place; and that this and similar desecratory monuments form the connecting link between the apostolic tradition and the time of Constantine (Krafft, p. 172). 4. A distinction must be drawn between the statements of tradition regarding the holy places in general, and the description of special points; and it is an erroneous conclusion, when we entertain doubts regarding the former, because doubts attach themselves to the latter (Krafft, p. 234). Schultz represents Golgotha as a rocky height, which rose straight up over against the city, having a precipitous face toward north and east, and was in this way a kind of stage, exposed to the eyes of all the city's inhabitants.

As regards the *Via dolorosa*, or *Via crucis*, or the Lord's road from the prætorium to Golgotha, mention was first made of it in the fourteenth century (Krafft, p. 168). The real way trod by our Lord must have lain somewhat more to the south.† Braune's statement, that the way was about an hour's walking, is incorrect: it was very much shorter.

On the discovery of the holy cross by Saint Helena, the Basilika erected on Golgotha by her, and the present Church of the Holy Sepulchre, consult the Church Histories, and works of travel to the holy land. The central-point in the history of the Holy Sepulchre is the Crusades; but the fact, that the Mohammedans still possess the spot, is less saddening than that Christian sects contend and fight over the holy places, that this contention gave occa-

views. Korte, a German bookseller, who visited Jerusalem, A. D. 1738, at the same time with the learned Pococke, was the first who took a stand against the supposed identity of the spot of the Holy Sepulchre with the place of the crucifixion and sepulchre of our Lord. The late Dr. Robinson, of Union Theol. Seminary, New York, strongly opposes the old tradition, and lays down the general principle "that all ecclesiastical tradition respecting the ancient places in and around Jerusalem and throughout Palestine *is of no value*; except as far as it is supported by circumstances known from the Scriptures or from other cotemporary testimony" (*Bibl. Researches in Palestine*, etc., vol. i. p. 258 and iii. p. 263 of the last Boston edition. Comp. also JAMES FERGUSON, art. *Jerusalem*, in W. Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. i. p. 1028 sqq. RITTER, WINER, BARTLETT, STANLEY, and ELLICOTT, leave the matter doubtful.—P. S.]

* [Comp. also on the same side CHATEAUBRIAND, who led the way in this century in a plausible defence of the old tradition, reasoning mainly *a priori* that the Christians must have known from the beginning and could never forget the places of Christ's death and burial (*Itinéraire de Paris à Jerusalem*, Paris, 1811); TISCHENDORF (*Reise in den Orient*, Leipzig, 1846, vol. ii. 17 ff.); GEO. FINLEY (*On the Site of the Holy Sepulchre*, London, 1847); OLIN; PRIME; LEWIN (*Jerusalem*, London, 1861); G. WILLIAMS (*The Holy City*, London, 1845; 2d ed. 1849, 2 vols.). Dr. Alford on Matt. xxvii. 33 does not enter into the merits of the question, but gives it as his opinion that Williams "has made a very strong case for the commonly received site of Calvary and the Sepulchre." The question is of little practical importance. The main argument in favor of the identity is derived from the unbroken Christian tradition. But while we are reluctant to break with a tradition of such extent, it is repugnant to sound Christian feeling to believe that a spot so often profaned and disgraced by the most unworthy superstitions, impostures, and quarrels of Christian sects, should be actually the sacred spot where the Saviour died for the sins of the race. At all events the testimony of tradition in such a case is not so important as maintained by Williams when he affirms that "the credit of the whole Church for fifteen hundred years is in some measure involved in its veracity." The Christian Church never claimed geographical and topographical infallibility, and leaves the question of the holy places open to fair criticism. The Apostles and Evangelists barely allude to the places of Christ's birth, death, and resurrection. They fixed their eyes upon the great facts themselves, and worshipped the exalted Saviour in heaven, where He lives for ever. It was only since the age of Constantine, in the fourth century, that those localities were abused in the service of an almost idolatrous superstition, yet not without continued protest from many of the wisest and best men of the Church. From the Gospels so much only appears with certainty as to the place of the crucifixion, that it was out of the city, Matt. xxviii. 11; John xix. 17; comp. Heb. xiii. 12; yet near the city, John xix. 20; apparently near a thoroughfare, as may be inferred from Mark xv. 29; and that the sepulchre was near the place of the crucifixion, John xix. 41, in a garden and hewn in a rock, Matt. xxvii. 60 and the parallel passages.—P. S.]

* [Or accurately *Goah*, גֹּעָה, the *th* being added to connect the Hebrew particle of motion,—*Goathah*. Gesenius derives it from גָּעָה, *to low*, or *moo*, as a cow. Hence also the translation of the Targum the *heifer's pool*. The Syriac, on the other hand, has *leromto*, *to the eminence*, perhaps reading גֹּאָה.—P. S.]

† ["If the trial of the Lord was at the palace of Herod on Mount Sion, He could not have passed along the *Via dolorosa*." Andrews, l. c. p. 534.—P. S.]

sion lately to a bloody war, and that the superstitious deception of the holy Easter-fire forms the chief attraction of the feast of Golgotha!

Ver. 34. **Gave Him to drink.**—It became a custom in later times, among the Jews, to give to those who were led away to execution a stupefying draught (Synedr. 6; Wetstein on Mark xv. 23; Friedlieb, 141). The Rabbins considered this a custom of holy mildness, and would ground it upon Prov. xxxi. 6 ["*Prodeunti ad supplicium capitis potum dederunt, granumque thuris in poculo vini, ut turbaretur intellectus ejus, sicut dicitur: date siceram*, etc."]. In the days of the Christian martyrs, it sometimes happened that similar drinks were administered to the condemned on their way to execution by friends and brethren in the faith who accompanied them (Neander, *Leben Jesu*, p. 757). It cannot be shown to have been a Roman custom. Nevertheless the Roman soldier carried with him a wine, which, though weak in itself, was strengthened by being mixed with various roots. This common wine was called vinegar-wine (Mark), also vinegar (Matthew). Mark says myrrh was mixed with the wine.* The Jewish Sanhedrin appointed for this purpose a grain of incense to be mixed with a cup of wine. The physician Dioskorides says myrrh was also used; Matthew, however, adds, "**mingled with gall.**" By χολή the LXX. translate לַעֲנָה, *wormwood, quassia*. The Evangelist may have chosen the expression with reference to Ps. lxix. 22; but he has not marked the fulfilment specially. There is no trace of a later mythical tradition. The most common drink was vinegar-wine; the strongest and most stupefactive mixture, wormwood. Jesus refused this intoxicating draught decidedly, and that, too, knowing its nature: "**when He had tasted, He would not drink.**" The Romans named such a drink, significantly, *sopor*. Jesus did not thus afterward refuse the unmixed vinegar-wine when He thirsted, and had finished His work.

Ver. 35. **And having crucified Him,** σταυρώσαντες δὲ αὐτόν, κ.τ.λ.

1. *The Cross*, σταυρός: primarily a pale or beam, *crux*, two beams fastened together in the shape of a T; of these, the longer, called *staticulum*, projected often upward the shorter, or cross-beam, called *antenna*.† In the middle of the larger beam there was a peg or a piece of wood, on which the sufferer rested; and this formed one of the most excruciating agonies of the cross.* The height of the cross was not great, and the feet of the criminal were not more than two feet from the ground.

2. *The Crucifixion.* The most extreme capital punishment among several ancient nations; it was practised even by the Persians, Ezra vi. 11; Esther vii. 9; still, the Persian instrument of execution was something between the Roman cross and the Germanic gallows. The cross of the Romans was the severest punishment for the worst criminals, and so disgraceful, that it dare not be inflicted on Roman citizens (*crudelissimum teterrimumque supplicium*, Cicero, *Verr.* 5, 64); only slaves, highway robbers, rebels, and outlawed prisoners of war, were made to suffer it (Joseph. *Bell.* v. *Jud.* 11, 1, etc.).† Those condemned to the cross must first be scourged; then bear their own cross, also a tablet upon the breast stating their crime, as far as the place of execution, which lay outside the city, upon a thronged highway, or upon some exposed spot, that the crucified criminals might be mocked and at the same time inspire terror. When they had reached this place of execution, they were stripped, and, after the stupefying draught was administered, they were raised up and nailed to the cross, which had been previously erected, and above which was placed an inscription. There was, no doubt, another mode, according to which the criminals were fastened to the cross while it yet lay on the ground. But it would appear that the former was the more usual method (Friedlieb, p. l. c. 142). The arms were first extended and fastened to the cross-beam. The body rested upon a peg in the centre in a riding manner, which prevented the hands from being torn through, and allowing the person to fall. The feet, too, were fastened. Then began the nailing. The old traditional view of the Church, that the feet of the Lord were nailed as well as His hands, was contradicted since 1792 by Dr. Paulus, who maintained that the feet of Jesus were only bound. But this assertion has been disproved by Hengstenberg, Hug, and Bähr (consult Tholuck, *Die Glaubwürdigkeit der evangelischen Geschichte;* Hug, *Gutachten*, ii. 174; Friedlieb, l. c. p. 144). The first proof that feet and hands were both fastened by nails, is supplied by Luke xxiv. 39, where Jesus, after His resurrection, shows the disciples His hands and feet (with the marks in them). Again, we have the testimonies of the oldest Church Fathers, who wrote at a time when this punishment was still practised, upon this subject, namely, Justin Martyr, *Dial. c. Tryph.* 97; Tertullian, *Advers. Marc.* iii. 19. Further, heathen writers testify that the feet as well as the hands were nailed: Plautus, *Mostellaria*, Act ii.

* [There is no necessary contradiction, as asserted by Meyer and Alford, between the "vinegar mingled with gall" of Matthew and the "wine mingled with myrrh" of Mark, since the common wine of the soldiers was little better than vinegar, and since χολή, *gall*, is used in the Septuagint for various kinds of bitter substances. *See* Winer, sub *Essig*, vol. i. p. 849 f.—P. S.]

† [There were three forms of the cross: 1. *Crux immissa* or *capitata*, a transverse beam crossing a perpendicular one at some distance from the top, = †. According to tradition this was the form of the Saviour's cross, which is thus commonly represented on ancient coins and in modern pictures of the crucifixion. There is no proof of this, but it appears probable from the fact that the "title" was placed *over the head*. The so-called *Greek* cross is a form of the *crux immissa*, where the two beams cross each other in the middle, and the four arms are of equal length. 2. *Crux commissa*, a transverse beam placed on the top of a perpendicular one, resembling the letter T. 3. *Crux decussata*, or *St. Andrew's* cross, like the letter X. The cross which appeared to Constantine, was of this form, with the Greek letter R in it, so as to represent the first two letters of the word Christos = ☧. *See* pictures of coins of Constantine in Baronius' *Annales ad ann.* p. 312; in Münter's *Sinnbilder der alten Christen*, p. 36 sqq., and the second volume of my *Church History*, p. 27 sq.—P. S.]

* [This needs explanation. The projection on the middle of the larger beam, on which the sufferer sat, a wooden pin called *sedile* (ἐφ᾽ ᾧ ἐποχοῦνται οἱ σταυρούμενοι, Justin Mart. *Dial. c. Tryph.* p. 318), was rather a relief, and prevented the weight of the whole body from falling upon the arms, which otherwise would soon have been torn from the nails. But in protracting the sufferings, it may be said to have been a chief source of pain.—P. S.]

† [Crucifixion was abolished as a punishment by Constantine, the first Christian emperor, no doubt under the influence of the humane spirit of Christianity, which in this and many other features improved the Roman legislation, first indirectly and then directly, from the time of Trajan and Marcus Aurelius (although these emperors were heathen and persecutors) to Justinian. Comp. the writer's *Church History*, vol. ii. (now in course of publication) § 15, p. 107 f.—P. S.]

Scene 1.* There is no reference made here by the Evangelist to Ps. xxii. 16.† This is a matter not to be overlooked. Moreover, the explanation of the words כָּאֲרִי [which the English Version renders: *they pierced*] is acknowledged to be very difficult and doubtful (compare Hengstenberg, Ewald, Hitzig [also Hupfeld, Delitzsch, and J. A. Alexander] on the passage). The *typical* Messianic reference of Ps. xxii. to the sufferings of Christ does not, however, depend on verse 16th, although the similarity is very striking. See Meyer also on this passage. The spirit of torture of the old world must naturally manifest its inventive powers in the augmentation of the pains of this punishment. So arose the habit of crucifying with the head downward (Peter's death), and such like (see Friedlieb, l. c. p. 146). Hence, too, arose the *crux decussata*, in an oblique form, in the shape of the letter X, upon which Andrew is said to have bled to death. The Roman punishment of crucifixion was introduced into Palestine after that country had become a province of the Roman empire. Meeting with a similar punishment, of a Jewish character, a modification ensued. Among the Jews, those who had been stoned to death were hanged upon a tree to excite terror, on the condition that the corpse was not to remain on the tree, but should be buried the same day; for one who is hanged is cursed of God (Gal. iii. 13), and the land was not to be polluted by such an one (Deut. xxi. 22, 23). Hence the Jews employ, of crucifixion, the more usual תָּלָה, *to hang*, and Christ is designated in Jewish polemical works, *the hanged*. According to the Roman custom, the crucified were not taken down: they were allowed to die slowly; and in the case of young and strong men, this continued sometimes three days. Their flesh was given to the birds, or other wild animals. At times their sufferings were shortened, by kindling a fire beneath, or allowing lions and bears to tear them to pieces. But the Jewish custom did not permit that, partly from a sense of humanity, partly from regard to symbolic purity. The bodies must, according to the law just quoted, be taken down and buried. Hence arose the Roman *Crucifragium*, the breaking of the legs (otherwise a punishment in itself); and with this a "mercy-stroke" was at times associated, which ended the pain of the sufferer. Were they already dead, the *Crucifragium* was superfluous; but to make sure of death, the easier mercy-stroke was given, that is, the body was pierced by a lance. We see in the Jewish custom two things, which were combined into one in the Roman: 1. The torturing execution; 2. the public exposure to insult and mockery; 3. the kindling of a fire beneath is the third point, and indicates an annihilating burial. Nero, probably, in his persecutions of the Christians, carried the thing further; later it became common; and the Inquisition, in the Middle Ages, employed this legacy of the Romans, and cherished it lovingly.

3. *The Agonies of the Cross.* Crucifixion was the most extreme punishment, shame, and torture, which could be devised by the old world, as represented by the severe Roman court of criminal justice. Only the Inquisition, with its fiendish inventions, has been able to surpass this torturing death. There are two sides, agony and disgrace. Each side presents three acts. The agony includes scourging, bearing the cross, suffering on the cross. The torture of the cross begins with the pain of the unnatural method of sitting on a peg, the impossibility of holding up the weary head, the burning of the nail-pierced hands and feet. Besides this, there is the swelling of arms and legs, feverish thirst and anguish, the gradual extinction of life through gangrened wounds or exhaustion. The disgrace and mental suffering also presents a climax: The Scourged One appears as the detested; the expelled Cross-bearer, as the rejected of God and men; the Cross-suspended, as an object of horror, and of cursing (1 Cor. iv. 13; John iii. 14).—The unique character of Christ's sufferings lies, however, first, in the contrast between His heavenly healthiness and sensibility, and this hellish torture; secondly, in the contrast between His holiness, innocence, philanthropy, and divine dignity, and this experiencing of human contempt, rejection, and of apparent abandonment by God; above all, thirdly, in His sympathy with humanity, which changes this judgment, to which the world was surrendered, into His own, and so transforms it into a vicarious suffering. Upon the bodily sufferings of Christ, during the crucifixion, the physician Chr. Gottl. Richter has written four treatises (1775).*

They divided His garments.—"Perfectly na-

* [The passage of Plautus alluded to above, reads thus: "*Ego dabo ei talentum, primus qui in crucem excucurrerit, sed ea lege,* UT OFFIGANTUR BIS PEDES, BIS BRACHIA." Here the only thing extraordinary is the repetition (*bis*), while the nailing of the feet itself is supposed to be the usual method. Each foot was probably nailed to the cross separately, and not both by one nail. In earlier pictures of the crucifixion, Christ was attached to the cross by three or four nails indifferently. Early tradition speaks of four nails. After the thirteenth century the practice prevailed of representing the feet as lying one over the other and both penetrated by only one nail. It is possible that the crown of thorns remained upon His head as represented by painters, since Matthew and Mark mention the removal of the purple robe by the soldiers, but not of the crown. *See* Friedlieb, *Archæol.* p. 145, and Andrews, *Life of Christ*, p. 583.—P. S.]

† [Not: *ver.* 17, as in the Edinb. edition, which follows the German quotations of Psalms here and elsewhere, not knowing that the German, like the Hebrew Bible, treats the inscriptions of the Psalms as part of the text and numbers them as ver. 1, while the Authorized English Version separates them from the text in smaller type. Hence all the German references to Psalms, which have an inscription, must be changed to suit the English Bible. The important words referred to above are: *they pierced my hands and my feet.*—P. S.]

* [Dr. CHRISTIAN FRIEDRICH G. RICHTER, born 1676, died 1711, was a pious physician of the Orphan House in Halle, and the author of thirty-three excellent German hymns full of unction, several of which have passed into common use in public worship (*e. g., Freuet euch, erlöste Brüder; O Liebe, die den Himmel hat zerrissen; Es kostet viel, ein Christ zu sein; Es ist nicht schwer, ein Christ zu sein; Mein Salomo, dein freundliches Regieren; Es glänzet der Christen inwendiges Leben; O wie selig sind die Seelen*). He thus describes the physical sufferings of the crucifixion: 1. On account of the unnatural and immovable position of the body and the violent extension of the arms, the least motion produced the most painful sensation all over the body, but especially on the lacerated back and the pierced members. 2. The nails caused constantly increasing pain on the most sensitive parts of the hands and feet. 3. Inflammation set in at the pierced members and wherever the circulation of the blood was obstructed by the violent tension of the body, and increased the agony and an intolerable thirst. 4. The blood rushed to the head and produced the most violent headache. 5. The blood in the lungs accumulated, pressing the heart, swelling all the veins, and caused nameless anguish. Loss of blood through the open wounds would have shortened the pain, but the blood clotted and ceased flowing. Death generally set in slowly, the muscles, veins, and nerves gradually growing stiff, and the vital powers sinking from exhaustion.—But all the ordinary sufferings of crucifixion give us but a faint idea of the sufferings of the sinless Godman and Redeemer of the world, which stand out solitary and alone,—the unexhausted and inexhaustible theme for meditation, gratitude, and worship to all ages and generations of the redeemed. *See* the excellent remarks of Dr. Lange in the text. Even the infidel Rousseau exclaimed: If Socrates lived and died like a sage, Jesus of Nazareth lived and died like a God.—P. S.]

ked did the *cruciarii* hang upon the cross (Artemid. 2, 58; Lips. *De cruce* 2, 7), and the executioners received their clothes (Wetstein upon this passage). There is no ancient testimony to show that there was a cloth even round the loins. See Thilo, *Ad. Ev. Nicod.* 10, p. 582." Meyer. There is, however, also a "retrospective" prophetic view; and the Jewish custom is to be remembered, the sympathy of the heathen captain, Christ's mother beneath the cross, etc. The garments became the property of the soldiers, after Roman usage. The outer garment was divided probably into four, by ripping up the seams. Four soldiers were counted off as a guard, by the Roman code. The under garment could not be divided, being woven; and this led the soldiers to the dice-throwing. Matthew presents the different points as a whole.

Casting lots.—For the more explicit account, *see* John xix. 23.—**That it might be fulfilled.**—According to the textual criticism (*see* above), we are led to think these words introduced from John, "although it is worthy of attention, that ῥηθὲν ἀπὸ τοῦ προφ. belongs only to Matthew." De Wette. One is induced, certainly, to side with the minority of witnesses in this case. The addition is supported not merely by the mode of speech used by Matthew, but also especially by the fact, that he has put the crucifixion into the Aorist participle, as though he would emphasize particularly the fact brought forward by the finite verb. And this cannot be the division of the garments in itself, but its import. Accordingly the case stands thus: either the majority of the scribes have taken objection to the expression, ὑπὸ τοῦ προφήτου, or the others have expanded the words, "they divided His garments, casting lots," according to Matthew's meaning. The construction shows, however, that this explanation was intended. The prophecy in the psalm is of a typical nature. Upon the misconception of the passage, Ps. xxii. 19, which Strauss charges home upon the Evangelist, *see* the author's *Leben Jesu*, ii. 3, p. 1602 (German edition).

Ver. 36. **And sitting down, they watched Him there.**—The watch was set to prevent those who had been crucified from being taken down. In this case, they had a peaceful bivouac which assumed a significant meaning.

Ver. 37.—**And they set up over His head, etc.**—The circumstance that the *cruciarius*, according to Dio Cass. 54, 8, was compelled to carry a "title" stating his guilt, suspended from his neck and resting upon his breast, while being led to the place of execution, justifies the conclusion that it was the custom to set up this title also above the criminal's head, when fastened to the cross. We learn the same from the transactions regarding this title recorded by John, who lays peculiar stress upon the double meaning and significance of the superscription, chap. xix. 20. This title, according to Matthew, was attached after the division of the clothes. The very soldiers seem to feel that the statement of the crime was not in this case the chief matter. The small, white tablet, upon which the accusation or sentence of death stood inscribed, was called *titulus*, σανίς, or also λεύκωμα, αἰτία. —**This is Jesus, The King of the Jews.**—No other crime but this. The Jews have crucified their Messiah. He has His title of honor; they have their shame.

Ver. 38. **Then are two robbers crucified with Him,** σταυροῦνται.—At this moment, and not till then, *are* (present). "By another band of soldiers;" for those who crucified the Lord have seated themselves beneath the cross. This arrangement was a combination devised by Pilate. First, the crucified Jesus is decked with the title, King of the Jews; then two robbers, as the symbol of His Jewish kingdom, are crucified. This was the governor's revenge, that the Jews had overcome him, and humbled Him in his own estimation.—**Two robbers,** λῃσταί.—The usual punishment for such an offence was crucifixion. They were in all likelihood no common robbers, but fanatical insurrectionists, chiliastic enthusiasts, such as are frequently met with in later Jewish history. Comp. **Mark xv. 7.**

Ver. 39. **But they that passed by.**—Not laborers going to their work (Fritzsche, de Wette), but the people who, on the afternoon of the feast-day, were walking about outside the gate, and going toward this populous quarter, where a new town was rising. As we previously remarked, Golgotha was a rocky height, turned toward the city, forming thus a natural stage for the public exposure of the crucified. And there the citizens of Jerusalem came forth this day purposely, to walk about with pleasure.—**Shaking their heads.**—"Not as a sign of *disapprobation*, but, as we may see from Ps. xxii. 8—as a gesture of passionate and malignant joy: compare Job xvi. 4; Ps. cix. 25; Isa. xxxvii. 22; Buxtorf, *Lexic. Talm.* p. 2089." Meyer. Query, was not disapprobation hidden under this malignant joy?

Ver. 40. **Thou that destroyest the temple.** Following the participial form, more accurately, *the destroyer of the temple* (ὁ καταλύων τὸν ναόν). The popular accusation brought against Him by the citizens of Jerusalem, proud of their temple, though the false witnesses upon the trial had contradicted one another. Still, they understood that there lay in *the rebuilding within three days* an announcement of a delivering power, and also a claim laid to Messianic dignity: hence the summons, **Save Thyself,** and the parallel sentence, explanatory of the first: **If Thou be the Son of God, come down from the cross.** —The witty mockers do not dream that He will really within three days rebuild the temple which they had destroyed. The parallelism, putting the words into poetic form, makes of the utterances a song of derision, which they improvise in their satanic enthusiasm, as is still often observed in the East upon similar occasions.

Vers. 41-43. **The chief priests . . . with the scribes.**—The burghers *blaspheme*, for they were at first stung with feelings of disapprobation; the members of the Sanhedrin *mock*, for they think they have achieved a perfect victory. But their mockery is no less blasphemy: and here, too, appears that poetic parallelism which makes a derisive song out of their mocking. But the mockery rises in this case to frenzy:—**He saved others** (forced recognition), **Himself He cannot save** (blasphemous conclusion). Then, **He is King of Israel:** ironical no doubt, and again a wicked conclusion. Finally, **He trusted in God** (with blasphemous reference to Ps. xxii. 9); and the godless conclusion, in which blasphemy against Christ passes unconsciously over into blasphemy against God, for whose honor they pretend to be zealous. Besides this, they unconsciously adopt the language of the enemies of God's servant, Ps. xxii. Thus are the statements, and even the prayers, of finished fanaticism usually filled with blasphemies. **If He will have him,** εἰ θέλει αὐτόν:—if He has pleasure in him, after the Hebrew

יְחָפֵץ בּוֹ. It is worthy of note, that the mocking speech of the Sanhedrin consists of three members, while that of the other mockers presents but two.

Ver. 44. **The robbers also,** etc.—Apparent contradiction of Luke xxiii. 39. 1. Meyer and others: It is an actual contradiction. 2. Ebrard and others: It is only a general expression, indefinitely put. 3. The older harmonists, Chrysostom, and others: At first, both mocked; afterward, only one. 4. At first, both mocked, ὠνείδιζον, in so far as they demanded that He as Messias should descend from the cross. But this the one did, as a nobler chiliast (millennarian), and with a heart filled by enthusiastic hopes; the other, in a despairing spirit. Afterward, the former resigned all earthly hopes, and in his death turned to the dying Christ; the other in his despair blasphemed the dying Lamb (ἐβλασφήμει, Luke). *See* the author's *Leben Jesu*, ii. 3, p. 1565.

Ver. 45. **Now, from the sixth hour there was a darkness,** etc.—Since the third hour, or nine o'clock in the morning, Jesus had been hanging on the cross; from the sixth hour,—accordingly at midday, when the sun stood highest and the day was brightest, which also was the middle-point in His crucifixion-torments,—the darkness began. This statement regarding the time, appears to be opposed to that in John xix. 14, where we read that it was the *sixth* hour (ὥρα ἦν ὡς ἕκτη), when Pilate pronounced sentence. If we adopt Tholuck's view, that John follows the reckoning of time usual in the Roman forum, we obtain too early an hour. The periods of the day being reckoned especially according to the hours of prayer, 3, 6, 9, we may understand the passage thus: the third hour (nine o'clock in the morning) was already past, and it was going, was hastening on, to the sixth hour. The sixth hour was held peculiarly sacred by the Jews, especially upon the Sabbaths and the festivals. Mark's statement is analogous, ch. xv. 25: it was the third hour when they crucified Jesus. Mark, like Matthew, contemplates the scourging as a part of the crucifixion; and that occurred between the third and sixth hour. This cannot have been an ordinary eclipse of the sun, because the Passover was celebrated at the time of full moon. Moreover, Luke mentions the darkening of the sun after the darkening of the earth; and hence it is manifest, that he ascribes the darkness which spread over the earth to no mere eclipse; but he ascribes, on the contrary, the darkness of the sun to a mysterious thickening of the atmosphere. The Christian Fathers of the first century appeal to a statement which is found in the works of Phlegon, a chronicler under the Emperor Hadrian (Neander, p. 756). Eusebius quotes the very words, under the date of the 4th year of the 202d Olympiad: "There occurred the greatest darkening of the sun which had ever been known; it became night at mid-day, so that the stars shone in the heavens. A great earthquake in Bithynia, which destroyed a part of Nicæa."*

Hug and Wieseler (*Chronol. Synopse*, p. 388) reject this reference, inasmuch as Phlegon speaks of an actual eclipse. But when we see that Phlegon unites that eclipse with an earthquake, we may reasonably conclude he refers to some extraordinary natural phenomenon. Still, as it is alleged that the reckonings do not agree accurately with the year of Christ's death (either two or one year earlier, *see* Wieseler, p. 388; Brinkmeyer, *Chronologie*, p. 208), we let this reference rest upon its own merits. Paulus and others make the darkness to be such as precedes an ordinary earthquake. Meyer, on the contrary, asserts that it was an *extraordinary*, *miraculous* darkness. Without doubt, the phenomenon was associated with the death of Jesus in the most intimate and mysterious manner. But the life of the earth has something more than its mere ordinary round; it has a geological development which shall go on till the end of the world. This development is conditioned by the development of God's kingdom, forms a parallel to the same, and agrees in all the principal points with the decisive epochs in the kingdom of God (*see* the author's *Leben Jesu*, ii. 1, p. 312; and *Positive Dogmatik*, p. 1227). Accordingly, the death of Jesus is accompanied by an extraordinary occurrence in the physical world. But that these occurrences, as natural phenomena, were produced by natural causes, cannot be denied. For, improper as it is to represent the wonder in nature as a simple, accidental occurrence in nature, it is equally improper to set nature outside of nature herself, or to deny the natural side of the wonder in nature. This darkening of the sun is then to be connected with a miraculous earthquake, which again stood connected with the occurrence in the life of the divine Redeemer, which we are now considering. The moment when Christ, the creative Prince, the principle of life to humanity and the world, expires, convulses the whole physical world. In a similar moment of death, is nature to go to meet her glorification. When Christ was born, night became bright by the shining of the miraculous star, as though it would pass into a heavenly day; when He died, the day darkened at the hour when

* [I add the original of the remarkable passage of PHLEGON, who was a freedman of the heathen emperor Hadrian, and wrote a *Sylloge Olympionicarum et Chronicorum:* Τῷ Δ ἔτει τῆς Σ Β ὀλυμπιάδος ἐγένετο ἔκλειψις ἡλίου μεγίστη τῶν ἐγνωσμένων πρότερον, καὶ νὺξ ὥρᾳ ἕκτῃ τῆς ἡμέρας ἐγένετο, ὥστε καὶ ἀστέρας ἐν οὐρανῷ φανῆναι. Σεισμός τε μέγας κατὰ Βιθυνίαν γενόμενος τὰ πολλὰ Νικαίας κατεστρέψατο. The same passage is quoted by Julius Africanus, A. D. 222, in Syncellus' *Chron.* 257, Ven. 322, Par.: Φλέγων ἱστορεῖ ἐπὶ Τιβερίου Καίσαρος ἐν πανσελήνῳ (in the middle of the month) ἔκλειψιν ἡλίου γεγονέναι τελείαν ἀπὸ ὥρας ἕκτης μέχρις ἐννάτης. Another heathen historian, THALLUS, as quoted by Julius Africanus, mentions the same eclipse of the sun: τοῦτο τὸ σκότος ἔκλειψιν τοῦ ἡλίου Θάλλος ἀποκαλεῖ ἐν τρίτῃ τῶν ἱστοριῶν. Eusebius mentions a third authority without naming it. To these testimonies must be added those of Tertullian, Origen, Rufinus, who boldly appeal to the Roman archives for the proof of the eclipse of the sun at the time of the Saviour's death. *See* on this whole subject the learned astronomical investigation of Dr. SEYFFARTH, *Chronologia Sacra*, Leipzig, 1846, p. 180 ff. and p. 281 ff. Seyffarth, who defends the *æra Dionysiaca* as correct, both as to the year and day of Christ's birth, puts this eclipse on the 19th of March, A. D. 33, and regards it both as a natural and as a supernatural phenomenon. He infers this even from Phlegon's testimony, who says that this eclipse surpassed all others ever seen (μεγίστη τῶν ἐγνωσμένων πρότερον), and yet there can be no greater *natural* eclipse of the sun than a total eclipse, such as is not unfrequently witnessed in every generation. But the majority of orthodox commentators regard it as a purely supernatural event on account of the time of the passover in the full moon, when the sun cannot be obscured by the moon. So also Meyer, Stier, Alford, Wordsworth, who calls it a σκότος θεοποίητον, Andrews, and Nast. At all events, the unanimous testimony of all the synoptical Gospels must silence all question as to the universal belief of this darkness as a *fact*. The omission of it in John's Gospel is of no more weight than the numerous other instances of such omission. The darkness was designed to exhibit the amazement of nature and of the God of nature at the wickedness of the crucifixion of Him who is the light of the world and the sun of righteousness.—P. S.]

the sun shone in fullest glory, as though it would sink into the awful night of Sheol. Heubner, referring to the eclipse mentioned by Phlegon, says, Suidas relates that Dionysius the Areopagite (then a heathen), saw the eclipse in Egypt, and exclaimed: "Either God is suffering, and the world sympathizes with Him, or else the world is hurrying to destruction." *See* also, p. 457, the well-known statement of Plutarch (*De oraculorum defectu*). Ships which were sailing toward Italy, passed by the island Paxe. The Egyptian helmsman, Thamus, heard a voice bidding him say to the *paludes*, when he arrived, that the great Pan was dead. The announcement of this death called forth many outcries and a sound of bitter lamentation. Many interpretations of this mysterious legend.

Over all the land.—Theophylact: κοσμικὸν δὲ ἦν τὸ σκότος, οὐ μερικόν. Meyer agrees with this interpretation and thinks that, in accordance with the miraculous character of the whole event, ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν must mean here *over the whole earth*, and not *over the whole land* (as Erasmus, Maldonatus, Kuinöel, Olshausen, Ebrard, and others take it); yet he admits that the term must not be measured by the laws of physical geography, and expresses simply the faith of popular observation.* But the legitimacy of "the popular hyperbole" lies in this, that the Israelites used the "whole land" for the whole earth. There is a reference certainly to the whole world, though the natural phenomena may have been fully seen only in the holy land, Syria, and Asia Minor.—**To the ninth hour.**—Highly significant continuance of the darkness. Mere shadows of this gloom were the darknesses which accompanied the decease of Romulus and that of Cæsar. Virg. *Georg.* i. 164.

Ver. 46. **About the ninth hour Jesus cried out,** etc.—This is the only one of the "seven words" which is reported by Matthew and Mark: it is given accordingly in a pointed manner, and presented in its striking signification. Most exactly given by Mark in the vernacular Syro-Chaldaic dialect, **Eloi, Eloi,** etc.† With this single exception the above-named Evangelists mention merely the loud cry of the Saviour without giving its contents. **He cried out,** ἀνεβόησεν; or, He shrieked with a loud and strong voice. The exclamation itself is given in its original form, as the "Talitha Cumi" and the "Abba" in Mark (ch. v. 41, xiv. 36). Σαβαχθανί, Chald. שְׁבַקְתַּנִי = Heb. עֲזַבְתָּנִי. "The citation of this exclamation in the original tongue is fully and naturally explained by the mockery of ver. 47, which rests upon the similarity of sound. The Greek translator of Matthew's Gospel was accordingly forced to retain the Hebrew words, though he adds the translation." Meyer.—*Explanation* of this cry: 1. Vicarious experience of the divine wrath (Melanchthon and the older orthodox school). 2. Testimony that His political plans had failed (Wolfenbüttel Fragments). 3. Mythical, founded on Ps. xxii., the programme of His sufferings (Strauss). 4. Lamentation, expressed in a scriptural statement, showing He had the whole psalm, with its sublime conclusion, before His mind (Paulus, Schleiermacher). 5. Objective or actual momentary abandonment by God (Olshausen). 6. Subjective momentary abandonment or feeling of being forsaken by God. De Wette, Meyer. The latter says that Christ was "for a moment overpowered (!) by the deepest pain;" that "the agony of soul arising from His *rejection* by men, united with the torture of the body, which now surpassed endurance;" that "His *consciousness* of union with God was for the moment overcome by the agony." 7. Amid the faintness, or the confusion of mind at the presentiment of approaching death, He *felt* His abandonment by God; and yet His *spirit* rested firmly on, and His *will* was fully subject to, God, while He was thus tasting death for every man through God's grace (Lange's *Leben Jesu*, ii. 3, p. 1573). Or the voice of conflict with death, a voice at the same time of victory over this temporal death to which humanity is subject. [We have in this exclamation an intensified renewal of the agony of Gethsemane, the culmination of His vicarious sufferings where they turned into victory. It was a divine-human experience of sin and death in their inner connection and universal significance for the race by one who was perfectly pure and holy, a mysterious and indescribable anguish of the *body* and the *soul* in immediate prospect of, and in actual wrestling with, death as the wages of sin and the culmination of all misery of man, of which the Saviour was free, but which He voluntarily assumed from infinite love in behalf of the race. But His *spirit* serenely sailed above the clouds and still held fast to God as *His* God, and His *will* was as obedient to Him as in the garden when He said: *Not My will but Thine be done.* While God apparently forsook Him, the suffering Head of humanity, in tasting death as the appointed curse of sin and separation from His communion, Christ did not forsake God, and thus restored for man the bond of union with God which man had broken. The exclamation: *My God, My God,* etc., implies therefore a struggle with death which was at the same time a defeat of the king of terror, and transformed death into life by taking away its sting, and completing the atonement. Hence the triumphant conclusion of the agony in the words: "*It is finished!*" Comp. the *Doctrinal Thoughts* below. There is great consolation in this dying word. Even if God hides His face from us, we need not despair; the sun of grace is still behind the clouds of judgment, and will shine through the veil with double effect.—P. S.]

Ver. 47. **This** (man) **calleth for Elijah.**—Explanation: 1. Misunderstanding on the part, *a.* of the Roman soldiers (Euthym. Zigabenus), *b.* of the common Jews (Theophylact), *c.* of the Hellenists (Grotius). 2. Meyer, following de Wette: "A blasphemous Jewish joke, by an awkward and godless pun upon Eli."* If we conceive to ourselves the state of matters, we may easily assume that joking and mockery were now past (*see* Luke xxiii. 48). It may be supposed that this loud cry, *Eli, Eli*, wakened up the consciences of the on-looking Jews, and filled them with the thought, Perhaps the turning point may now actually have come, and Elijah may appear to bring in the day of judgment and vengeance (Olshausen); and, occupied thus, they may not have heard the remaining words. It is by no

* [This passage is entirely mistranslated in the Edinb. edition, so as to give the very opposite sense. I compared Meyer's fourth edition, and gave his view more fully than Dr. Lange who quotes from the third edition. Alford confines the expression to that part of the globe over which it was day, but sees no strong objection to any limitation, provided the fact itself, as happening at Jerusalem, is distinctly recognized.—P. S.]

† [Wordsworth infers from this an argument for the use of *vernacular* Scriptures.—P. S.]

* [So Alford: "intended mockery, as οὗτος clearly indicates." Also Alexander, Ellicott, Andrews, Owen, Crosby, Stier, Nast, etc.—P. S.]

means far-fetched to imagine that the Jewish superstition, after the long-continued darkness, took the form of an expectation of a Messianic appearance. At least, we may say that they sought to hide their terror under an ambiguous pun upon the words.

Vers. 48, 49. **One of them ran and took a sponge.**—The word of Jesus: *I thirst*, had immediately preceded this act, as we learn from John; and, succeeding the cry: *Eli*, marks that Christ was now conscious of having triumphed. Under the impulse of sympathy, one ran and dipped a sponge in a vessel of wine which stood there (the ordinary military wine, *posca*); and then fastening the sponge upon a hyssop-reed, which when fully grown is firm as wood, gave it to the Lord to drink. (*See* Winer, art. *Hyssop*.) According to John, several were engaged in this act. According to Matthew, *the rest* cry out to the man who was offering the drink, **Wait (come), let us see whether Elijah will come to save Him.** According to Mark, the *man himself* cries, **Wait,** etc.—an accurate picture of the excitement caused by the loud cry of Jesus. The one party seem to see in this act a disturbance of the expectation; the others see in it the fulfilment of the request, and a refreshment to support life till the expectation should be fulfilled. De Wette thinks the offer was ironical; but he confounds the second with the first draught. His view, too, is opposed by Christ's reception of the second drink. Christ drank this draught, 1. because the wine was unmixed; 2. because now the moment of rest had come.

Ver. 50. **Jesus cried again,** κράξας.—The last words,—not those recorded in John xix. 30, but those in Luke xxiii. 46: **"Father, into Thy hands,"** etc. Meyer is disposed, without ground, however, to find in these words a later tradition, arising from Ps. xxxi. 5.* Paulus' assumption of a merely apparent death needs no refutation.

[As to the *order* of the seven words from the cross, the harmonists are not entirely agreed. The most probable order is that adopted by Stier, Greswell, Andrews, and others: Before the darkness: 1. The prayer of Christ for His enemies. 2. The promise to the penitent robber. 3. The charge to Mary and John. During the darkness: 4. The cry of distress to His God. After the darkness: 5. The exclamation: "I thirst." 6. "It is finished." 7. The final commendation of His spirit to God. Ebrard puts (3) before (2), Krafft (4) before (3).—P. S.]

Ver. 51. **And, behold, the veil of the temple was rent in twain.**—Full development of an earthquake, which was mysteriously related to the death of Jesus, and yet was quite natural in its progress. The rending asunder of the veil was a result of the convulsion, although the earthquake is mentioned afterward. Such is ever the case in an earthquake: its approach is marked by such fixed signs as the shaking of houses, etc. Meyer holds that neither the earthquake nor the darkness were natural. But nature and spirit do not in the Scriptures pursue different roads; here nature is conditioned by spirit. An earthquake, which is not natural, is a contradiction. Moreover, the veil which was rent was that before the Holy of Holies (הַפָּרֹכֶת, Ex. xxvi. 31 sq.; Lev. xvi. 2, 12), and not before the Holy Place. *See* Heubner, p. 459, for the refutation of this assumption of Michaelis.* This rending was a result of the convulsion, and at the same time a sign of the removal of the typical atonement through the completion of the real atonement, which ensures us a free access to God, Heb. vi. 19; ix. 6; x. 19. For the mythical embellishment of this fact, in the *Evang. sec. Hebr.*, *see* Meyer. [It is simply the exaggerating statement quoted by St. Jerome *in loc.*: "*In Evangelio, cujus saepe facimus mentionem* (he means the Gospel of the Hebrews), SUPERLIMINARE TEMPLI *infinitae magnitudinis fractum esse atque divisum legimus.*" This exaggeration, which substitutes a thick beam of the temple for the veil, presupposes the simple truth as recorded by Matthew. Meyer fully admits this event as historical (against Schleiermacher, de Wette, and Strauss), and assigns to it the same symbolical significance as Lange and all the orthodox commentators. Comp. Heb. ix. 11, 12; x. 19–23. There is neither a prophecy of the Old Testament, nor a Jewish popular belief, which could explain a myth in this case. The objection of Schleiermacher, that the event could not be known except to hostile priests, has no force, since the rumor of such an event, especially as it occurred toward the time of the evening sacrifice, would irresistibly spread, and since "a great company of the priests" were converted afterward, Acts vi. 7.—P. S.]

Vers. 51, 52. **And the rocks were rent.**—Progress of the miraculous earthquake: the firm foundation of the holy city begins to split.

The graves were opened.—Awful, significant phenomenon, introducing the following ghostly phenomenon. The whole forms a type and symbol of the general resurrection and the world's end, which is seen in its principle in Jesus' death, and hence is manifested by natural signs. The opening of certain particular graves in the neighborhood of Jerusalem was a special representation of the coming resurrection, particularly of the faithful. But it was typical as well as symbolic, as is evident from the spiritual apparitions which succeeded. [Travellers still point us to extraordinary rents and fissures in the rocks near the supposed or real spot of the crucifixion, as the effects of this earthquake. The Jewish sepulchres, unlike our own, were natural or artificial excavations in rocks, the entrance being closed by a door or a large stone. Hence it may be supposed that, besides the rending of rocks, the stone doors of the graves were removed by the force of the earthquake.—P. S.]

Ver. 52. **And many bodies of the saints who slept, arose.**—There is no ground for the opinion held by Stroth (in Eichhorn's *Repert.* ix. 1, p. 123) and by the elder Bauer (*Bibl. Theol. des Neuen Test.* i. 366), that both verses are interpolated. De Wette: "This surprising statement does not seem to belong to the common evangelical tradition.

* [Not: *ver.* 6, as the Edinb. edition has it, slavishly following the German here and in similar quotations, without referring to the passage, and ignorant of the difference of the German and English Bibles in numbering the verses of Psalms, which arises from a different view of the inscription in its relation to the Psalm. The passage here meant, is: "*Into thy hand I commit my spirit: thou hast redeemed me, O Lord God of truth.*" These were the dying words of Luther and of other great men. The τετέλεσται of John was said before the words recorded by Luke: *Father, into Thy hands I commend My spirit*, and the latter are *implied* in the παρέδωκεν τὸ πνεῦμα with which John relates the death of the Saviour immediately after the exclamation: *It is finished!* The connection must be plain to every one, and there is no excuse for Meyer's arbitrary assumption of the unhistorical character of the dying exclamation in Luke.—P. S.]

* [Origen likewise referred it to the outer veil, and thought that the inner veil would not be taken away till that which is perfect is come, 1 Cor. xiii. 10.—P. S.]

As even a legendary (mythical) representation, it does not harmonize well with the Messianic belief of that time (it may, to some degree, with the expectation of the first resurrection, Rev. xx. 4); and again, we cannot satisfactorily deduce the thing from the fact that a few graves were opened. (*See* Hase, § 148.) The legend is more fully developed in *Evang. Nicodemi*, cap. 17, 18." Meyer's view is, that the symbolical fact of the graves having opened, was transformed into the traditional history that certain persons actually arose; and hence he holds the passage to be an "apocryphal and mythical supplement." With the one fact, that the graves opened, agrees the other, that after Jesus' resurrection many believers saw persons who had risen from the grave, who had been delivered from Hades. These two facts became one living unity in the Apostle's belief regarding the efficacy of Christ's resurrection. Our text is thus the first germ of the teaching of the Church upon the *Descensus Christi ad inferos*, the development of which we have even in 1 Pet. iii. 19 and iv. 6. The appearance of the bodies may hence be regarded as symbolical; they were the representations of redeemed souls. The death of Christ is accordingly proved at once to be the life* of the world; as an atoning death and a triumphant entrance into Hades, it acted upon the spirit-world, quickening especially Old Testament saints; and these quickened saints reacted by manifold annunciations upon the spiritual condition of living saints. Accordingly, it is not miracles of a final resurrection which are here spoken of; but, on the other hand, neither is it a miraculous raising from death, as was that of Lazarus, to live a second life in the *present* world. In this respect, the order laid down in 1 Cor. xv. 20 continues, according to which Christ is the ἀπαρχή. "According to Epiphanius, Ambrose, Calovius, etc., these dead arose with a glorified body, and ascended with Christ.† In *Actis Pilati* (Thilo, p. 810) Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, the twelve patriarchs, Noah, are especially named. A different account is found in Evang. Nic." Meyer. A distinction is made in our text between the effect of the death of Jesus and His resurrection. By His death, the saints are freed from the bonds of Sheol ("their bodies arose"); by His resurrection, their action on this world is restored ("went into the holy city," etc.).

[There are six resurrections mentioned in the Scriptures as preceding that of Christ, but all of them are only restorations to the present earthly life, viz.: (1) The son of the widow of Sarepta, 1 Kings xvii. (2) The Shunamite's son, 2 Kings iv. (3) The resurrection caused by the bones of Elisha, 2 Kings xiii. (4) The daughter of Jairus, Matt. ix. (5) The son of the widow at Nain, Luke vii. (6) Lazarus, John xi. The translations of Enoch and Elijah from earth to heaven, not being preceded by death, do not belong here. The resurrection mentioned in our passage, if real, was a rehearsal, a sign and seal of the final resurrection to life everlasting, but did not take place till after the resurrection of Christ, μετὰ τὴν ἔγερσιν αὐτοῦ, which must be referred to the preceding ἠγέρθησαν as well as ἐξελθόντες. The rising was the result, not the immediate accompaniment of the opening of the graves, and is mentioned here by Matthew in anticipation, but with the qualifying insertion: *after His resurrection*, to prevent misunderstanding. Christ's death opened their tombs. His resurrection raised them to life again, that He might be the *first-born* from the dead (πρωτότοκος τῶν νεκρῶν, Col. i. 18), and the first-fruits of them that slept (ἀπαρχὴ τῶν κεκοιμημένων, 1 Cor. xv. 20, 23). Augustine, Theophylact, and others, supposed that these saints died again, while Origen, Jerome, Alford, Owen, Nast, and others, assume that they ascended with Christ to glory. There is also a difference of opinion among commentators, as to the question whether they were patriarchs and other saints of the *olden* times to whom Jerusalem was indeed a *holy* city, or saints who lately died and were personally known to some of the living. Owen favors the latter opinion with a doubtful "*doubtless*," and specifies Simeon, Hannah, and Zachariah. Dr. Nast adds John the Baptist and Joseph. But in the absence of all Scripture information, it is perfectly useless to speculate on the age and number of these mysterious visitors from the spirit world. So much only appears certain to us, that it was a supernatural and symbolic event which proclaimed the truth that the death and resurrection of Christ was a victory over death and Hades, and opened the door to everlasting life.—P. S.]

Ver. 54. **Now when the centurion.**—The centurion who had presided over the execution. *See* above.—**And they that were with him.**—The soldiers on guard, who at the beginning had been thoughtlessly gambling. Mark mentions, as the single witness of Christ's majesty in dying, this captain, who, along with the captain in Capernaum (Matt. viii.), and the captain Cornelius at Cæsarea (Acts x.), forms a triumvirate of believing Gentile soldiers, in the evangelic and apostolic histories. But Matthew associates with the centurion, his band; and Luke informs us, the consternation was general, ver. 48. The special testimony belongs, nevertheless, to the centurion.—**Saw the earthquake, and what was done.**—Not only the destructive effects of the earthquake upon the rocky region of Golgotha, but also the way in which Christ gave up His spirit (Mark and Luke).—**Truly this was God's Son** [Θεοῦ υἱός].—Luke says, *a just man*. The word of a heathen must not always be taken in a heathen meaning (so Meyer, *Heros, demi-god*); least of all, here. Heathen became Christians, and their conversion was announced by their Christian confession. Yea, the centurion may easily have been acquainted with Jewish opinions; and so the accusation, Jesus had made Himself Messiah and God's Son, was understood by the captain rather in a Christian sense, of a divine-human holy being, than in a heathen sense of a demi-god. The heathen coloring is exceedingly natural; but the germ is evidently not a superstitious conceit, but a confession of faith. [Alford likewise maintains against Meyer that the centurion used the words in the *Jewish* sense, and with some idea of what they implied. But the absence of the article before υἱός and the parallel passage in Luke should not be overlooked.—P. S.]

Vers. 55, 56. **And many women were there.**—Luke gives us an accurate account of these female disciples, ch. viii. 2. They followed the Lord upon His last departure from Galilee, served Him, and supported Him out of their property. Matthew names, 1. **Mary Magdalene.** She was, judging from her name, a native of Magdala, on the Sea of Gennesareth; and hence she is supposed to have been the

* [The Edinb. edition has just the reverse: "*the death* of the world."—P. S.]

† [The fathers, however, correctly assumed that the dead did not actually arise till after the resurrection of Christ. JEROME *in loc.*: "*Non antea resurrexerunt, quam Dominus resurgeret, ut esset primogenitus resurrectionis ex mortuis.*"—P. S.]

sinner who turned unto the Lord in that district, and anointed His feet, Luke vii. 37. Out of the Magdalene, according to Mark, seven devils had been driven by Jesus; that is, He had wrought a miraculous deliverance of an ethical, not of a physical character (*see* the author's *Leben Jesu*, ii. 2, 730 ff.); and this exactly agrees with the pardon of the great sinner. She is of course to be clearly distinguished from Mary of Bethany (John xii. 1). Meyer says: "מגדלינא is mentioned by the Rabbins (Eisenmenger, *Entdecktes Judenthum*, i. p. 277); but this must not be confounded with מגדלא, a female hairdresser, with whom the Talmud identifies the mother of Jesus (Lightfoot, p. 498)." 2. **Mary the mother of James and Joses**, that is, the wife of Alpheus (John xix. 25), sister-in-law of Joseph, and of the mother of Jesus. [?] 3. **The mother of Zebedee's children**, *i. e.*, **Salome**: *see* ch. xx. 20. She it is, undoubtedly, who is meant by the *sister of Christ's mother*, John xix. 25. The Evangelist chooses to name just these without excluding the mother of Jesus, and the other ministering women. "Hence we must reject the unnatural assumption of Chrysostom and Theophylact, which Fritzsche repeated, although Euthym. Zigabenus refuted it, that the mother of Jesus is the same with Mary the mother of James and Joses, ch. xiii. 55." Meyer.

[Matthew and Mark (xv. 40) omit *Mary the mother of the Lord*, while John (xix. 25) expressly mentions her first among the women who stood by the cross, but omits Salome, his own mother, unless we assume with Wieseler and Lange that she is intended by "His mother's (Mary's) sister," so that John and James the Elder would be cousins of Jesus. Luke mentions no names, but speaks generally (xxiii. 49): "And all His acquaintance, and *the women that followed Him from Galilee*, stood afar off, beholding these things." To account for the omission of Mary by Matthew and Mark, we must suppose either that she had at that time left the cross with John who took her to his home in obedience to the dying request of the Saviour (John xix. 26), or that there were different groups, the one mentioned by Matthew and Mark consisting only of those who ministered to the wants of our Lord of their substance (διακονοῦσαι αὐτῷ, ver. 55). There must have been another group of disciples, including John and others, to whom He afterward showed the print of the nails as a proof of His identity. Comp. Luke's *all His acquaintance*. The previous flight of the disciples, mentioned Matt. xxvi. 56, does not exclude their return to witness the mighty scenes "*afar off*." John certainly was there, according to his own statement. These pious women, who, with the courage of heroes, witnessed the dying moments of their Lord and Master, and sat over against the lonely sepulchre (Matt. xxvi. 61), are the shining examples of female constancy and devotion to Christ which we now can witness every day in all the churches, and which will never cease. Woman's love truly is faithful unto death. Women and children form the majority of the Church militant on earth, and, we may infer, also of the Church triumphant in heaven.—P. S.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *See* the preceding remarks.

2. The prevailing point of view from which the Evangelist represents the crucifixion and its agonies, is the *fulfilment of the Old Testament types*. Hence it is that he twice makes the *chief fact* merely introductory, which is marked by the use of the participial form, and brings out into prominence some *special circumstance* as the *chief thought* by the use of the finite verb. 1. Καὶ ἐλθόντες εἰς τόπον Γολγ., ἔδωκαν αὐτῷ πιεῖν, κ.τ.λ., vers. 33, 34. 2. Σταυρώσαντες δὲ αὐτὸν, διεμερίσαντο, κ.τ.λ., ver. 35.

3. The four chief points in the history of the passion, before us, are: (1) *Jesus in the power of the Gentiles:* (*a*) they press a Jew into the service of the cross; (*b*) they offer their stupefying drink to the Lord while dying; (*c*) they divide among themselves, and gamble for, His clothes, and guard His corpse; (*d*) they make the King of the Jews a robber-chief. (2) *Jesus in the power of the Jews:* (*a*) the derisive song of the people; (*b*) Christ blasphemed by the chief of the Jews and the teachers; (*c*) insulted even by their own dying criminals—He can give us no help. (3) *Jesus sinks into apparent hopelessness, and with Him the Jewish and Gentile world, though then it is that He is really victorious:* (*a*) the funeral pall of the world, or the darkening of the noon-day sun; (*b*) Jesus' exclamation, or the judgment of death; (*c*) the last disappointed chiliastic expectation of help from Elijah here; (*d*) the last cry of Jesus, or the dark mystery of redemption. (4) *The destruction of the world's old form, and the signs of redemption and of the new world:* (*a*) the temple service, or the slavery of conscience in this world, removed,—the access to the throne of grace in the Holy of Holies free; (*b*) the prison of Sheol, or the slavery of the spirits in the other world, removed,—the way of resurrection open; (*c*) the power of the Gentile tyrannical rule removed,—the Gentile centurion compelled, in his terror of soul, to make a confession of faith; (*d*) the slavery of women (and of the oppressed classes) removed,—the believing women, in their heroic spirit of faith, free.

4. *Simon of Cyrene*, an illustration of the fate which befel the Jews after Christ's crucifixion under Gentile masters. An omen of the maltreatment and shame which were awaiting the Jews at the hands of the Gentile world, but likewise of their end; the Jews are to be excited and compelled by the Gentile world to take up the cross of Christ (Rom. xi.). Remarkable issue! Even up to that moment, the Jews still were imagining that they had subjected the Gentiles to themselves in the crucifixion of Christ, while the subjection of the Jew to the Gentile was now really becoming visible.

5. *Golgotha*, the old world's accursed place of execution, transformed by Christ into the place of pilgrimage for the new world, and into the new city of Jerusalem.

6. The intoxicating drink, the old world's remedy in suffering, anguish, and torture, proved by Christ, and rejected by Him with full and clear consciousness. The sympathy of the world with the suffering Christ, the complaint of Christ regarding the world's consolations; and He, conscious of a truer comfort, does away with all these unavailing consolations of the old world.

7. The gamblers beneath Christ's cross changed into confessors of His glory. The heirs of His coat are at the end witnesses of His spirit. The military guard changed beneath His cross into a camp of peace.

8. Christ, the King of the Jews, between the thieves, distinguished as a robber-chief, become the

royal Saviour and Judge of the world. The same title which honored the Lord, was the shame of the Jews.

9. *The feast celebration of the unbelievers:* (1) The people walk up and down before the cross, and blaspheme; (2) the hierarchical powers mock; (3) the transgressors and despairing are angry, and revile. God, however, condemns: (1) The first in their ignorance, speaking as they do merely from lying hearsay; (2) the second in their raving wit, in that they condemned themselves by openly blaspheming against God, while they imagine that they mock Christ (the bulls of the Romish Church, consigning Christians to perdition); (3) the third in their thoughtlessness, who dream not that redemption is so near; (4) generally, the millennarian expectations, according to which the old world is to be glorified, destitute of salvation though it be. But God, condemning this old world, founds a new world of redemption and salvation.

10. *The darkness over the earth.*—The indication of that development which this terrestrial cosmos is to pass through, according to the teaching of Scripture. The sign that the earth, and not the sinner only, suffers from the curse (Gen. iii.; Deut. xxviii.); that the earth sympathizes with Christ (Zech. xi.); the presage of the earth's final (eschatological) death and victory (Matt. xxiv.).

11. *Eli, Eli.*—The darkness which spread over the heavens was a visible representation of the state of Christ's soul during this period of silent suffering upon the cross. The bodily effects of the crucifixion began at this time to cease. The inflammation arising from the wounds in His hands and feet, the lacerated brow and back stretched on the cross, and the inner fire of the fever, consumed His strength. The great interruption in the flow of blood, which formerly circulated so peacefully, weighed down His head, oppressed His heart, and took from Him the joyous feeling of life; and, suffering these agonies, the Lord hung during the long weary hours beneath the heaven's mourning blackness. At last the dizziness experienced before fainting must begin to make itself felt,—that condition in which consciousness commences to dream, to reel, to be lost, and then returning, to behold the awful apparitions presented by the imagination. This is a state in which we see how near death is related to madness. Jesus was experiencing the approach of death. He was "tasting" death,—tasting death as only that holy and pure Life could taste death. But in this His death, He felt the death of mankind; and in this death of mankind, their condemnation to death. This experience He adopted as His own, receiving it into His own consciousness, and then sanctified it by His loud cry to God: "*My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?*" In that cry, His deep, full feeling of that great, full death, was changed into a prayer to God; and so His contest with and victory over death, became the glorification of death by the destruction of its *sting:* the completion of the atonement. His experience of being forsaken by God is expressed in the words: *forsaken Me;* His soul's firm hold on God, in the words: *My God, My God!* The question: *Why,* is not the murmuring objection of one in despair, but the question of God's child and servant; and almost immediately afterward, in the hour that He became conscious of victory, and cried aloud: *It is finished,* He received the answer through the eternal Spirit. From the beginning of His life He *knew* this, but in this moment it became a *fact of experience,* that He gave His life for the life of the world; and this enabled Him to declare soon afterward that all was now completed. We should not, accordingly, look upon this exclamation of Jesus as an exceptional singularity in Christ's sufferings, but as the real climax, with which judgment changed into victory, and death, the result of the curse, becomes the glorious redemption. This cry of Jesus, which is in one sense the darkest enigma of His life, becomes, when thus considered, the most distinct and most transparent declaration of the atonement. The doctrine of the personal union of the divine and human natures is as little disturbed by this passage as by the soul-sufferings of Jesus in Gethsemane; for the Evangelist refers to no unholy fear and trembling of His human nature, but to a holy one. But if divinity was really and fully united in Him with humanity, then His divine nature, even in the deepest depths of His human suffering, must be united with His human. And this was manifested here. No alteration was produced in God, however; but the deepest human pain, in other cases called despair, the full feeling of death becomes glorified as the fullest atoning submission.

12. *The 22d Psalm.*—The numerous points of agreement between this psalm and the history of Christ's passion, led Tertullian to say that the psalm contained *totam Christi passionem.* We may regard all the psalms as Messianic in the widest sense, and arrange them into: (1) Such as contain isolated Messianic references; (2) such as are typical of the life, sufferings, and victory of Christ; (3) such as are acknowledged prophecies of the ideal Messiah, and of the Messiah's kingdom. The 22d psalm belongs to the second class. For manifestly in it a servant of God under the old economy describes his own unbounded theocratic Messianic sufferings. The representation becomes, without the writer's knowledge, but truly with the Spirit's knowledge, typical of the bitter agonies of Christ (comp. the author's *Positive Dogmatik,* p. 673).

13. *The curtain in the temple, before the Holy of Holies* (*see* the descriptions of the temple in Winer, etc.).—This curtain was not merely torn in one spot: it was rent into two pieces, from top to bottom. This circumstance signifies that the real atonement was perfected; accordingly, that typical offerings and priestly mediation were done away; that the access to the throne for every believing soul, in the name of the Father, and of the Spirit of Christ, is now quite free. This view we might support from many a Scripture passage (Rom. iii. 25; v. 2; the entire Epistle to the Hebrews). And hence, the excitement which takes place in the realm of death, which hitherto was under bondage, is the result, not of Jesus' mere entrance into the realm of death, but of His entrance into the same in the might of His atoning death. Thus, too, is the *idea* of spiritual apparitions here *realized;* but these apparitions are to be entirely distinguished from the appearance of ghosts. *See* the article *Gespenst* (*Spectre* or *Ghost*) in Herzog's *Real-Encyklopädie.*

14. *The effects of the atoning death of Jesus:* (1) Upon the realm of the dead (beginning of the resurrection); (2) upon the Gentile world (beginning of confessions); (3) upon the world of the oppressed classes, namely, of women: free communion with Christ, in spirit, suffering, and victory.

15. At the siege of Jerusalem by Titus, the Jews sallied forth from the city in bands to free themselves, and were nailed by the Romans by hundreds to the cross. The cross of redemption cast upon the Jews

numberless shadows of itself, as crosses of condemnation.

16. The cross, which to the old world was the symbol of deepest abhorrence, shame, infamy, and perdition, has now become for the new world the symbol of honor, blessing, and redemption. Even the superstition and vanity of the world have adopted this sign. It has risen to be the object of veneration. It is the original form of most of our orders of honor. But the glorification of the cross is the symbol and type of the transformation of death from a curse into salvation.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

On the Whole Section. — *See* the preceding christological reflections.—Christ treated as the slave of mankind: 1. By the Jews, estimated at a slave's price; 2. by the Gentiles, executed like a slave.—A contemplation of Christ's cross: 1. The *sufferings* of the cross,—(*a*) on the side of the Gentiles, vers. 32–38; (*b*) on the side of the Jews, vers. 39–44. 2. The *contest* on the cross, vers. 45–50: (*a*) its reflection in the natural contest between light and darkness; (*b*) its culmination,—the contest between life and death in the heart of Christ (*Eli!*); (*c*) the false explanation (Elijah): (*d*) the decision (the drink of refreshment, the cry of triumph *). 3. The *fruits* of the cross, vers. 51–56: (*a*) symbol of the atonement; (*b*) of the resurrection; (*c*) of the conversion of the Gentiles; (*d*) of the companionship with Christ in suffering and victory.—The cross as the truest exemplification of, and testimony to: 1. Christ's patience; 2. man's guilt: 3. God's grace.†—Christ on Golgotha.—The Lord's silence and utterances in His death-hour: 1. His unbroken silence as regards the impotent hostility of the world. 2. His holy utterances: (*a*) His cry of suffering and of victory addressed to God; (*b*) His cry of awakening and of victory, addressed to men.—The mysteriousness of the atonement: 1. The *deep darkness* in which its central point is hidden: (*a*) the conceit of the Gentiles, who imagined that they crucified a transgressor; (*b*) the mockery and blasphemies of the Jews; (*c*) the darkening of the sun; (*d*) the silence of God; (*e*) the mysterious utterance of Christ Himself; (*f*) the misinterpretation of His words on the part of men, and the disappointed expectation. 2. *The clear light*: (*a*) the clear and kingly consciousness, which would not submit to be stupefied, and which would suffer sensibly, free from opiates; (*b*) the distinct testimony to truth, which shines forth in spite of all the perversions of enemies (the King of the Jews, God's Son, who saved others, who trusted in God, from whom the dying, no more than the living, can free themselves); (*c*) the instinct of nature, which testifies by its mourning to Jesus' glory; (*d*) the freedom and obedience with which Jesus adopts death as His own, and thus conquers; (*e*) the glorious results of the death of Jesus.—The Lord's death: 1. The result of the world's most deadly hate; an unparalleled murder and death. 2. The result of Christ's unconquerable love; the all-comprehensive death, in that all died in the One. 3. The result of God's grace; it was the world's redemption (its atonement, deliverance, illumination, sanctification).—The sublimity of the atoning death of Jesus, as it appears: 1. Towering above the most fearful and terrific guilt (blasphemy); 2. overcoming the most terrible temptation (the struggle against abandonment by God); 3. bursting through the most formidable barriers (the feeling of death); 4. displaying boundless and eternal efficacy (extending as far as the highest height of heaven, the depths of Sheol, the depths of the Gentile world, the depths of the human heart).

The Particular Portions.—Christ led to the cross: 1. The way to the cross, the falling cross-bearer; the greatest burden and oppression. 2. The place of the cross, or Golgotha, the place of a skull, the heaviest ban and curse. 3. The endurance of the cross the severest agony and shame. 4. Christ's companions in crucifixion, the bitterest mockery and derision.—Simon of Cyrene; or, the man, coming from the country, who unconsciously became involved in the history of the cross.—Let us go forth with Him without the camp, bearing His reproach, Heb. xiii. 13.—Golgotha, the place of blackest curse, changed into the place of greatest blessing.—Golgotha and its counterparts: 1. The counterparts of its curse: (*a*) the wilderness; (*b*) the grave; (*c*) the battle-field; (*d*) Sheol; (*e*) Gehenna. 2. The counterparts of its blessing: (*a*) Paradise and Golgotha—Paradise lost and regained, Golgotha present and disappeared; (*b*) Sinai and Golgotha—the law and the gospel; (*c*) Moriah * and Golgotha—the shadow and the substance; (*d*) Gethsemane and Golgotha—the sufferings of the soul, and the sufferings of the cross; (*e*) Olivet and Golgotha—triumph, and suffering changed into the most glorious triumph.—The honors which the blinded people of Israel prepared for their King: 1. The procession of honor (beneath the weight of the cross); 2. the wine of honor (vinegar mingled with gall); 3. the guard of honor (gambling over the booty, His clothes); 4. the seat of honor (the cross); 5. the title of honor (King of robbers).—The intoxicating bowl and its false salvation rejected for the true salvation, which Christ with full consciousness has obtained for us.—The despairing world, and its means of strength.—Christ assures Himself of the clearness of His consciousness, and so of victory.—Soberness the necessary condition of all deliverance, 2 Tim. ii. 26.—Moral and physical intoxication, the beginning of destruction; moral (spiritual) and physical soberness the beginning of salvation.—Christ must taste our death, Heb. ii. 9; He preserved a pure taste for that duty.—The visible inheritance left by Jesus, and the inheritance left to His spiritual heirs; 1. The visible inheritance: a booty of Gentile soldiers, an inheritance for which they gamble, cast lots, and squander their time. 2. The spiritual inheritance: His righteousness, His peace, His word and sacrament.—*And sitting down, they watched Him.* See how the duty of the military guard changes beneath the cross into a camp of rest, through the spirit of peace, which proceeds from Christ.—The fulfilment of the Old Testament in Christ's sufferings; or, Christ presented with gall to drink, robbed, the King of the Jews.—Christ between the robbers; or, the beginning of His kingdom: 1. In His power to save; 2. in His power to condemn.

* [The Edinb. translation substitutes for *culmination*, *the doubtful issue*, for *decision* (*Entscheidung*), *dissolution*, and for *cry of triumph* (*der Siegesschrei*, viz.: *It is finished!*), *the death-cry!*—P. S.]

† [In German an untranslatable rhyme: *Christi Geduld, der Menschen Schuld, Gottes Huld.*—P. S.]

* [The Edinb. edition has here: *Mary*, mistaking the German *Moria* for *Maria*, and this in spite of the connection, which makes it sufficiently plain that *Mount Moriah* is intended, as the seat of the *temple*, which represents the types and shadows of the Jewish worship.—P. S.]

—The blasphemy against, and the mockery of, the Crucified One; or, the sins of unbelief and obduracy.—Even the mocking and blaspheming foes of Christ must, against their will, praise Him.—The enthusiasm of derision and its result, the song of scorn: the most matured fruit of death.—The reviling robbers; or, dissatisfaction of the crucified transgressors with the crucified Saviour may issue in two different results: 1. It may lead to an unconditional surrender; 2. or to despair.

The darkening of the earth and the sun, the heavens' testimony to the dying Jesus. A testimony: 1. That creation is dependent upon Christ's consciousness; 2. that nature is entirely dependent upon spirit; 3. that the fate of the earth is entirely dependent upon the fate of the kingdom of God.—The last hiding of the holy God from the Crucified One, becomes, through the enduring trust of Christ, a presage of His full revelation.—*Eli, Eli;* or, the last struggle, and victory in one battle-cry.—Christ's suspense upon Golgotha, the return and the culmination of His suspense in Gethsemane; 1. The full realization of abandonment; 2. the perfect harmony between His will and that of God.—Christ has altered condemnation to mean deliverance, and has thus given it its true meaning: 1. He changed the death, which sprang from the curse, into salvation; 2. He changed the mourning, which nature in her anger assumed because of Him, into compassion.—The crucified Jesus our trust and peace in the severest trial.—"He calls for Elias;" or, Christ crucified even in His utterances.—The last destruction of worldly expectations of deliverance, the beginning of the true deliverance.—Christ's thirst slaked by His foes: a sign of His repose after the fight. 1. In the wilderness, He hungered after He had fought and fully vanquished, and angels ministered unto Him; 2. here he thirsted after the victorious struggle, and His enemies are compelled to minister unto Him.—Jesus receives His last refreshing draught out of the hands of His enemies in token of peace,—in token that His love has vanquished the world's hate.—Christ's last cry, though wordless, was doubtless a cry of triumph.—Death was overcome in Christ's death, and the sun returned.—*And lo, the veil rent.*—The glorious and saving efficacies of the death of Jesus: 1. Atonement; 2. the dead redeemed, and the right of resurrection given to them; 3. the world's conversion; 4. the perfection of the heart.—The new order of things instituted by the death of Jesus: 1. Believing suppliants have become priests (the rent veil); 2. the dead arise; 3. Gentile soldiers fear God and confess Christ; 4. women stand beneath the cross, and beside the grave, God's heroines.—The spiritual apparitions at Jerusalem, a spring flower of the resurrection.—The earthquake at Christ's death a sign of the world's fate under the working of Christ; a sign: 1. Of the end of the old world: 2. of the beginning of the new, Hag. ii. 6.

Selections from Other Homiletical Commentators.

Starke:—Simon of Cyrene, the picture of all believers; for they must bear the cross after Christ, 1 Pet. iv. 13; Luke ix. 23; Gal. v. 24.—If we lovingly help others to bear their cross, we do a good work.—*Luther's margin:* Golgotha, the gallows, and the block.—He would not receive the draught, because He would suffer with full understanding, and had still various utterances to pronounce.—*Nova Bibl. Tub.:* See how the Life-fountain pants with thirst, to atone for golden wine-goblets, excess, and drunkenness.—We should carefully guard our senses and our reason.—*Luther's margin:* The garments of righteousness do not require to be divided, every one employs them whole and altogether.—*Hedinger:* Christ's poverty our wealth, His nakedness our covering.—Christ in the midst of the thieves: this figure gives us to see Jesus surrounded by the two bands of soldiers.—He was reckoned with the transgressors.—Suffering is with some a suffering of martyrdom; with others, penance; with others, a self-inflicted punishment, 1 Pet. iv. 15, 16.—*Zeisius:* Christ's cruel mocking, the best remedy against the world's envenomed mocking and derision.—Thou who destroyest the temple! The world has learned in a masterly way to pervert the words of the pious.—What worldlings do not understand of the mysteries of Christ, is to them only matter of contempt, scorn, and ridicule.—The *darkness* signifies: 1. The power of darkness, of sin, and of death over Him, who is the Sun of Righteousness; 2. the horror of this murder, from which the sun immediately hid his face; 3. that the Sun of Righteousness was darkened to the Jews, and the light of grace withdrawn, John xii. 46.—*Quesnel:* Whosoever will not follow Christ, the light of the world, shall remain in darkness, and shall end by being precipitated into eternal darkness.—That Christ does not here say: *My Father*, but *My God*, must have its special reason.—All is dark before His eyes; he cannot know when the end and deliverance should come (?).—We had forsaken God; hence must Christ, again, be forsaken for our sake.—Learn from this example, that both may be true,—united with God, forsaken of God,—when the heart has had no experience of the power of the Spirit, of the divine life, of the sweetness of God's love, of the hope of eternal glory.—The last cry: He roars when He snatches, as the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the prey from hell.—*Luther's margin:* The veil rends: here is the crisis, and an entirely new existence begins, as when the prophet says: "His rest shall be glory," Isa. xi. 10.—Such a rent reveals: 1. That every shadow would be now, through Christ, distinctly illuminated; 2. that He, by His Spirit, would remove every covering and darkness from the law; 3. that the atonement was complete, so that it was not annually to be repeated; 4. that all had now a ready access to the Father; 5. that all ceremonies had ceased.—*Bibl. Wurt.:* Heaven, which had been closed, is now once more opened, Heb. ix. 11, 12.—The most firm and hard bodies in nature spring asunder; how is it then that man's heart is so hard?—Christ has deprived death of his power, 2 Tim. i. 10.—The centurion: those who acknowledge God's mighty works, and fear in consequence, are near conversion.—The women: the grateful forsake not their benefactors in time of need.—Friends and relations should remain united even in suffering.

Gerlach:—In their blindness, the members of the Sanhedrin mocked Him, employing, without willing it, the words of the enemies of the Messiah, from Ps. xxii. 9, which passed dimly before their mind; and in this manner, the prophecies of this Psalm receive a literal fulfilment. A circumstance which has been often repeated. When Farel stood before the ecclesiastical court in Geneva, and denounced the mass, the president asked the bench: "He has blasphemed God, what further need have we of witness? What think ye?" They all replied: "He is guilty of death."—Jesus upon the cross lived the 22d Psalm

through, in His body and in His soul. His word: *It is finished!* points to its conclusion, ver. 24.—The veil, the type of earthly, sinful, mortal human nature, rent,—earth, the theatre of sin, was shattered,—the heathen soldiers (chiefly of the German race, for the Romans had at that time a German legion in Palestine), were deeply impressed by the majesty of Jesus.

Lisco:—Every man mocks in his own way, and in the terms that come most readily; and so here the scribes revile in the language of Scripture.

Heubner:—He was obedient to the death of the cross.—If Jesus had not trod this path, we had been led to the execution-place of hell.—He was cast out of the city of God, that we might obtain an entrance into the heavenly Jerusalem.—He had carried His cross from youth onwards upon His heart, now He beareth on His shoulders the tree of shame.—If we would have consolation from the cross of Christ, we must determine to enter into the companionship of the cross, by crucifying lusts within, and bearing the cross of shame cast upon us from without.—The highest honor is to bear Christ's cross.—Golgotha: here the Prince of Life overcame death upon his own territory.—This place was part of the Moriah chain, upon which Isaac was to have been offered up.—The drink: the Christian never betakes himself, when suffering and oppressed with care, to worldly pleasures, sensual enjoyments, intoxication, 1 Tim. v. 23 (the Stoics intoxicated themselves, to deaden their pains).—The world always gives gall to God's children; Christ has tasted all this bitterness for us.—Why was this mode of death chosen by Christ? 1. It was the most painful and shameful death; (*a*) the most painful: the body was stretched out, Ps. xxii. 18, gaping wounds, thirst, exposure to the wind and changing weather; (*b*) the most shameful: quite naked, the Roman mode of punishing slaves, accursed of the Jews, Deut. xxi. 23. 2. The most appropriate for revealing Christ's glory to contemporaries and to posterity, a lingering and visible dying. 3. He hangs, lifted up on the cross. He draws to Himself the looks of all the world. 4. He hangs there as the atoning Mediator, typified by the paschal lamb and the brazen serpent: (*a*) upon a tree. The serpent was to be overcome upon a tree, having overcome the first man upon a tree. (*b*) Suspended between heaven and earth as Mediator. (*c*) Set in the pillory in the place of men. He took all up with Himself.—*Lavater*: Jesus Christ upon the cross, Satan's greatest triumph, Satan's greatest defeat: 1. The cross, expressive symbol of self-denial, of self-sacrificing love; 2. the greatest of God's wonders, the mystery of all mysteries, the holy symbol (the cross in the heavens of the Southern Hemisphere).—Naked and poor did Jesus hang upon the cross, indicating that He renounced all possessions of earth, all honor, all rule, stripped Himself entirely, and hung there an offering consecrated to God, which *had all its value in itself alone*.—The superscription of the cross is: 1. In the meaning of Pilate, an apparent justification of the Jews; 2. according to God's intention, a punishment of their vain and selfish Messianic expectations; 3. to all time, a declaration of the true, heavenly, kingly dignity of Jesus.—The blasphemy: a High Priest who wishes to destroy God's temple, a Saviour who does not save Himself, a Son of God who appeared to be forsaken by God on the cross, seems to us self-contradictory; but a High-Priest who removes the shadow to bring in the religion of the Spirit, a Saviour who offers Himself up, a Son of God who is obedient to His Father even unto death, is to the spiritual eye an object worthy of adoration.—They did not know what to reproach Him with, except His piety, His benevolence, His trust in God.—The one incomparable death. His death-hour was the world's most sacred hour.—The Roman guard: at last the hour of redemption strikes for many a hardened heart, when it acknowledges the Crucified One.—The soldier, despite his rough exterior, has an open, blunt manner, which keeps him, when moved, from concealing the truth or hardening his heart.

Braune:—The darkness ceased not till Jesus died.—Jesus, the light of the world, which shined in darkness, came to keep souls from darkness: He has finished His work; and the token of this completion we have in the expressive sign of the departing darkness, just as the bow of peace stretched a sign of peace over the falling waters of the deluge.—The dead and crucified Redeemer makes light.—We must renounce with Him the darkness of sin and error.—The following is found in *Angelus Silesius*: Though Christ were born a thousand times in Bethlehem, and *not in thee*, thou remainest, nevertheless, eternally lost.—If the cross of Golgotha is not erected in thy heart, it cannot deliver thee from the Evil One.—Mark, that it is to thee of no avail that Christ has risen, if thou continuest lying in sin and the bonds of death.

GOOD FRIDAY.—*See* FR. STRAUSS: *Das ev. Kirchenjahr*, p. 211; BOBERTAG: *Das ev. Kirchenjahr*, p. 150; BRANDT: *Homilet, Hülfsbuch*, 3 Bd., 298; *Archæological*. The Quadragesima, or the forty days of the passion-week, and of Lent, concludes with the Great Week, ἑβδομὰς μεγάλη, *hebdomas magna, Septimana major*. During this season, there was divine worship daily, morning and evening, much secret meditation, a strict fast was observed, and acts of beneficence performed. It began upon Palm Sunday (κυριακή s. ἡμέρα τῶν βαΐων), *dominica palmarum*. Among the holy days of this week, the fifth was specially celebrated, ἡ μεγάλη πέμπτη, *feria quinta paschæ*, as the commemoration of the last Passover, and the institution of the Lord's Supper (*dies cœnæ Domini*). All took part in the holy communion, which in some places was held at night, though this was an unusual time. And then, too, occurred the rite of Washing the Feet, introduced by the lesson from John xiii. 1–15. The origin of the later designation of *Green Thursday* [*Maundy Thursday*], *dies viridium*, is very obscure. Some deduce it from the custom of eating on that day fresh spring vegetables (probably with reference to the bitter herbs of the Israelitish Passover); others from the passage, Ps. xxiii. 2, the green pasture,* probably a symbol of the Holy Supper. The sixth day succeeded, παρασκευή, ἡμέρα τοῦ σταυροῦ, *dies dominicæ passionis*, as a day of humiliation and fasting. The meaning of the German names, *Charwoche, Charfreitag* (*Good Week, Good Friday*), is also uncertain; from *carus*, or χάρις, or the old German form of *küren*, to *choose*, or *karo*, *garo*, to *prepare*, to *equip*; hence = *preparation-week*, παρασκευή. "The *Constit. Apostolicæ*, v. 188, forbid any festivals οὐχ ἑορτῆς, ἀλλὰ πένθους, and enjoin the strictest fast, because this was the day of the Lord's suffering and death." The texts were in the rule taken from

* [The Edinb. edition has instead: *the green ear!* How the German: *grüne Aue*, could be thus mistaken, especially in connection with the quotation of Ps. xxiii. 2, I am unable to explain. Is it possible that the translator mistook *Aue* for *Aehre*?—P. S.]

the last section of the Passion-lesson (from the four Gospels), often from John xviii. and xix.; sometimes Isa. lii. 13–liii. Many preachers had no particular text.

Selections from Sermons.

Proclus :—As the whole state mourns when the king dies, so to-day the whole creation puts aside its joyous brightness.—O mystery! Christ to the Jews a stumbling-block, to the Greeks folly, but to us the power of God, etc.—*Schweizer* :—Simon of Cyrene: Am I still a servant through custom, and through compulsion, or am I filled with the freedom and joy of God's children?—*Ahlfeld* :—Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews: 1. A king upon the cross; 2. upon the cross a king.—*Schultz* :—The redemption which Jesus by His death hath purchased for us.—*Gentzken* :—What is the cross? 1. A *mirror*: there thou beholdest thy guilt. 2. A *seal* of God's grace and mercy. 3. *A temple of virtue.*—*Theremin* :—It is finished: 1. God's counsel; 2. the work of Jesus' love; 3. the good works of His people, finished in Him.—*Hossbach* :—With what consciousness the dying Saviour looked back upon His finished life.—*Mazeroll* :—Christ's death, the completion of His work.—*Schuderoff* :—Jesus' exaltation in His deepest humiliation.—*Hagenbach* :—How Jesus manifested Himself even in His sufferings as the Son of God.—*The same* :—To this very hour does the quiet congregation of the Lord gather together around His cross, amid all the tumult and bustle of this world (the same feelings, duties, consolation).—*Harms* :—The death of Christ, the chief lesson of faith, and the chief command to duty.—*Nitzsch* :—Christ's crucifixion viewed in connection with other acts of the world, and of worldly wisdom.—*Palmer* :—Jesus in the midst of robbers: in this we have shown: 1. Th Lord's gentleness and love; 2. the Lord's glory and judicial authority.—*Nitzsch* :—The contemplation of the dying Lord makes us of a different mind. It changes: 1. Our secure self-righteousness into repentance; 2. our wicked and despairing thoughts into confidence; 3. our repining into a willing endurance of trial, rich in hope.—*Drüseke* :—Christ's struggles, and our struggles.—*Bobe* :—Behold the Lamb of God!—*Florey* :—Christ upon the cross: 1. His shame is thy honor; 2. His weakness thy strength; 3. His lamentations thy peace; 4. His death thy life, 1 John i. 6, 9; 1 Cor. i. 30; 2 Tim. ii. 11.—*A. Knapp* :—The great sermon for the world which has gone forth from the cross of Christ: 1. What God preached; 2. what the heavens; 3. the earth; 4. the pious; 5. sinners; 6. the dying Jesus.—*Hofacker* :—The world-atoning death of Christ in its power and effects.—*Gaupp* :—What testimony the cross gives unto Jesus.—*Kapff* :—Consider how our atonement is completed through the death of Jesus.

The Seven Last Words.—The consideration of these words comes in more appropriately in the commentary on Luke and John. *See* Rambach: *Betrachtungen über die sieben letzten Worte Jesu*, 1726; Arndt: *Die sieben Worte Christi am Kreuz*, 1840; Braune: *Das Evangelium von Jesus Christus*, p. 425; Brandt: *Homilet. Hülfsbuch*, vol. iii. p. 326; Fr. Krummacher: *The Suffering Saviour*, 1857; Lange: *Auswahl von Gast- und Gelegenheitspredigten*, 2 Ausg. *Die sieben letzten Worte*, p. 208 sqq.

[This section is so rich and exhaustive that it would be mere repetition to add the practical reflections of the Fathers and the English commentators, whom we are in the habit of consulting and making contributors to the American edition of this work.—P. S.]

ELEVENTH SECTION.

THE BURIAL. THE SEPULCHRE SEALED.

Chapter XXVII. 57–66.

(Mark xv. 42–47; Luke xxiii. 50–56.)

57 When the even [evening] was come, there came a rich man of Arimathea, named
Joseph, who also himself was Jesus' disciple [who had become a disciple of Jesus]:[1]
58 He went to Pilate, and begged [asked for] the body of Jesus. Then Pilate command-
59 ed the body[2] to be delivered. And when Joseph had taken the body, he[3] wrapped it
60 in a clean linen cloth, And laid it in his own new tomb, which he had hewn out in the
rock: and he rolled a great stone to the door of the sepulchre [tomb],[4] and departed.
61 And there was Mary Magdalene,[5] and the[6] other Mary, sitting over against the sepul-
chre.
62 Now the next day [But on the morrow, τῇ δὲ ἐπαύριον], that followed the day of
the preparation [παρασκευή, Friday],[7] the chief priests and Pharisees came together unto
63 Pilate, Saying, Sir, we remember that that deceiver said, while he was yet alive, After
64 three days I will rise again. Command therefore that the sepulchre be made sure until
the third day, lest his disciples come by night,[8] and steal him away, and say unto the
people, He is risen from the dead: so the last error [deceit] shall [will] be worse than
65 the first. Pilate said[9] unto them, Ye have [Ye shall have] a watch: go your way

66 make *it* as sure [secure] as ye can [know how, ὡς οἴδατε].[10] So they went, and made the sepulchre sure [secure], sealing the stone, and setting a watch [together with the watch, μετὰ τῆς κουστωδίας].[11]

[1] Ver. 57.—[Dr. Lange reads with Lachmann the passive form ἐμαθητεύθη, which is sustained by Codd. C., D., and Cod. Sinait., instead of the *lect. rec.*: ἐμαθήτευσε (*to be one's disciple*), which has the majority of uncial MSS., including the Alexandrian and the Vatican, in its favor. Lange regards the former as more significant and emphatic: Joseph was overpowered. Tischendorf and Alford adhere to the received text. As to the use, Tischendorf remarks in his large edition: *Utriusque usus exempla in promptu sunt, nisi quod prius* (the active form) *apud antiquos ut Plutarchum invenitur, posterius* (the passive) *apud recentiores tantum. See* Stephan. *Thesaur.* Meyer and Alford regard ἐμαθητεύθη as a correction after μαθητευθείς, ch. xiii. 52.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 58.—Codd. B., L., and Fritzsche omit τὸ σῶμα. [So also Cod. Sinait., but the great body of authorities are in favor of it. De Wette and Alford explain the omission from regard to elegance, since τὸ σῶμα occurs thrice in vers. 58 and 59. Conant renders: *that the body should be given up.* Lange inserts in parenthesis *ihm, to him: dass der Leichnam* (*ihm*) *ausgeliefert würde.*—P. S.]

[3] Ver. 59.—[Or in the precise order of the Greek: *And taking the body, Joseph wrapped it*, etc., καὶ λαβὼν τὸ σῶμα ὁ Ἰωσ. ἐνετύλιξεν, κ.τ.λ.—P. S.]

[4] Ver. 60.—[The same word should be used in this verse, either *sepulchre* or *tomb*, for the Greek μνημεῖον, especially as the second with the article refers to the first.—P. S.]

[5] Ver. 61.—[Better with Conant and others: *And Mary M. was there*, to bring out more plainly the demonstrative ἐκεῖ.—P. S.]

[6] Ver. 61.—The article ἡ is omitted in Codd. A. and D., but sustained by most witnesses.

[7] Ver. 62.—[Παρασκευή, in the Jewish sense, is the day of making ready for the sabbath, or sabbath *eve*, *i. e.*, Friday, Matt. x.; Mark xv. 42; Luke xxiii. 54; John xix. 14, 31, 42; Joseph. *Antiq.* xvi. 6, 2 (ἐν σάββασιν ἢ τῇ πρὸ ταύτης παρασκευῇ), also called προσάββατον, Mark xv. 42. Compare the German *Sonnabend* for *Saturday*. The *day* of the English Version should be put in italics, as in John xix. 42, or omitted altogether. Here Tyndale and Cheke render the word: *Good Friday*, which is true enough, but goes beyond the term which is general. The Genevan Version adds: Preparation *of the sabbath*. The Rhemish N. T. retains the Greek after the Vulgate: *Parasceve*, which is unintelligible to the English reader. The best is to put *Friday* on the margin.—P. S.]

[8] Ver. 64.—The addition νυκτός is poorly sustained. [It is cancelled by the critical editors, and may have been inserted from xxviii. 13, where it is genuine. Lange puts it in small type in parenthesis.—P. S.]

[9] Ver. 65.—Codd. A., C., D. read δέ after ἔφη; it is probably an addition, and weakens the significant decision of Pilate.

[10] Ver. 65.—[So Syriac, Vulgate, Beza, Castalio, Scrivener, Conant, etc. Alford: "As ye know how, in the best manner ye can." Οἴδατε is not quite equivalent to δύνασθε, *as ye can*, or *are able*. The English Version in ch. vii. 11 literally renders οἴδατε, *know how*. Lange renders: *wie ihr's versteht. See* his *Exeg. Note in loc.*—P. S.]

[11] Ver. 66.—[The watch procured from Pilate aided them in securing the tomb and setting the stone. So Wetstein, Meyer, Scrivener, Conant, Lange. The preposition μετά signifies the *means whereby* they secured the tomb, as in Luke xvii. 15; Acts v. 26; xiii. 17, and in Thucydides viii. 73.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Synopsis.—John introduces this account by a statement of the motives that led to it. The Jews come, in the first place, to Pilate, requesting him to have the bodies removed, and thereupon Joseph of Arimathea entreats the governor to allow him to take the body of Jesus. Nicodemus is, according to John, associated with Joseph, and provides the spices for embalming. Mark and Luke characterize Joseph of Arimathea more exactly than Matthew. Special prominence is given by our Evangelist to the two Maries,—Mary Magdelene, and "the other" (the mother of Joses, according to Mark): they are represented here as seated opposite to the grave. The sealing of the sepulchre (vers. 62–66) is related by Matthew only.

Ver. 57. **When the evening was come.**—The first or early evening, the day's decline; because the bodies must have been removed before the evening arrived, Deut. xxi. 23; Josephus, *De Bell. Jud.* iv. 5, 2.

There came a rich man.—1. De Wette: He came into the prætorium. 2. Meyer: He came first to the place of execution to go thence to the prætorium. 3. He came to the little company of female disciples upon Golgotha, and advanced into their midst, proclaiming himself as a disciple. "A disciple, but secretly for fear of the Jews," says John. Luke: "A counsellor, a good man and a just. The same had not consented to the counsel and deed of them; . . . who also waited for the kingdom of God." Mark: "An honorable counsellor, who also waited for the kingdom of God." Matthew gives the prominence to his wealth: "A rich man," referring undoubtedly to Isa. liii. 9, according to the Septuagint translation, Καὶ δώσω τοὺς πονηροὺς ἀντὶ τῆς ταφῆς αὐτοῦ, καὶ τοὺς πλουσίους ἀντὶ τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ. The following translation is indeed free, but is agreeable to the context: They had appointed Him a grave with the despised; and among the honored (עָשִׁיר, did He obtain it) in His death.—The first occasion of this step of Joseph was probably his fear that the Jews might remove the body in some disgraceful manner; for the circumstances related John xix. 31–37 had preceded. Faith, however, shot a ray of hope, in all probability, through Joseph's mind, and operated along with this feeling of veneration, and his desire openly to confess the name of Christ.

Of Arimathea.—"Commentators are divided between Rama in Benjamin (Josh. xviii. 25) and Rama (Ramathaim) in Ephraim (1 Sam. i. 19, Samuel's birthplace). For the latter, indeed, the form speaks decisively; but the addition of Luke, πόλεως τῶν Ἰουδαίων, according to 1 Macc. xi. 34, does not harmonize." De Wette. *See* "*Ramah*" in Winer [and other Bibl. Encyclop.].

Named Joseph.—One Joseph is appointed to take care of Jesus in His infancy, another to provide for His burial. Quite analogous, there was an Old Testament Joseph, who had the task of providing for the Jewish people in its infancy in Egypt; and to him corresponds the Josephus who has prepared the historic resting-place for the expired Israelitish nation

in his books (*Antiq.*, *De Bello Jud.*, etc.). The name Joseph (יוֹסֵף) means, according to Gen. xxx. 24: "he adds" (Increaser); for another explanation, *see* Gesenius. He was βουλευτής, a member of the Sanhedrin, Luke xxiii. 50; not (as Michaelis supposed) a councillor of the little country-town Ramathaim, nor (according to Grotius) a town councillor of Jerusalem. Lightfoot makes him to have been a priestly temple-councillor; but that is probably the same as a Sanhedrist. According to the ecclesiastical tradition, he is represented to have belonged to the seventy disciples, and to have been the first who preached the Gospel in England (the rich man, the guardian-saint of a rich people; just as the Magdalene, the repentant sinner, is the patron-saint of France). For other traditions, *see Evangelium Nicodemi*, p. 12, and *Acta Sanct.* Mart. ii. 507. He was evidently, like Nicodemus, one of the secret disciples of Jesus, who came forth and publicly confessed their faith after the death of the Lord. Μαθητεύειν τινι, *to be the disciple of some one.* He was a follower of Jesus, and hence he had not consented to the murderous counsel of the Sanhedrin; and this holds good, of course, regarding Nicodemus.

Ver. 58. **He went to Pilate.**—He ran the risk, says Mark.* He was exposed to more danger from the Jews than from Pilate, because this act was a confession of his faith. "It was the Roman custom to allow the bodies to hang upon the cross till they wasted away, or were consumed by the birds of prey. Plaut. *Mil. glor.* ii. 4, 9; Horat. *Epist.* i. 16, 18.† But should friends request the bodies to be taken for interment, the request could not be refused, Ulpian 48, 24, 1; Hug, *De cadav. punit.* in the *Freiburger Zeitschrift* 5, p. 174." Meyer.—**That the body be delivered** (to him). Meyer is in favor of retaining the second τὸ σῶμα, the repetition having a certain solemnity.

Ver. 59. **He wrapped it in a clean linen cloth.**—Bengel: *Jam initia honoris.* Not a shroud, nor a garment (Kuinoel); but winding sheets, linen clothes, John xix. 40, in which the body was wrapped (Meyer). It was probably an entire piece at first, and was afterward divided for the purpose of rolling. This idea occurs to us from the object to be attained: the pieces of linen must be wrapped around the limbs in such a way as to enclose the spices, which had been powdered to be employed for embalming. The first, temporary anointing, and the intention of a second and more formal embalming, are both unnoticed by Matthew. But that the body was anointed, is self-evident; and the second formal anointing, which Mark and Luke declare to have been proposed by the women after the Sabbath, is not excluded by the merely temporary act. By the first anointing, they sought simply to preserve the body; by the second, they wished to fulfil the ceremonial requirements, for which no time remained upon Friday evening. Therefore, upon the first occasion, they made a profuse, but simple use of costly substances (myrrh and aloes); and the women would find no difficulty in buying before and after the Sabbath, upon the Friday evening before, and the Saturday evening after, from six o'clock, such quantities of these spices as appeared necessary to their womanly desires for the great burial: *see* Luke and Mark.

Ver. 60. **In his own new tomb.**—"It was a great disgrace among the Jews if any one had not a burying-place of his own; and so it came to be considered an act of charity to bury neglected dead bodies. Josephus mentions as among the abominable deeds of the Zelots and Idumeans, that they left their dead unburied." *See* Friedlieb, p. 169. The statement of John, that the tomb was in a garden *near* the place of the crucifixion, and was chosen on account of the necessary haste, is not contradictory of the statement that the grave was the property of Joseph.* It must have been exactly the location of his newly-formed family-tomb that led him to propose his grave, and yield it up as an offering.

In the rock.—With the article. In that particular rocky district of Golgotha. The Jews placed their graves outside their towns. It was only kings and prophets (and priests, indeed, no less) who might be interred inside the walls. Commonly, these graves were excavations, or grottoes in gardens, or in spots planted with trees; sometimes natural caves; often, as in this case, expressly hewn out (a costly method), and sometimes built up. These tombs were sometimes very roomy, and provided with passages. The sepulchres were either made with steps downward, or placed horizontally; while the particular graves inside were hollowed out, either lengthwise or crosswise, in the walls of the tomb. For more particular accounts, consult Winer (art. *Gräber—Graves*), and Schultz, *Jerusalem*, p. 97.†. The new rock-tomb of Joseph, and the hundred pounds of myrrh and aloes (myrrh, a resin from the myrrh-tree of Arabia and Ethiopia; aloes, a precious, fragrant wood; the pound, the Attic litra, five and a half ounces less than our pound), which Nicodemus presented, are expressions of that sacrificing renunciation with which now these two disciples advanced into view, after that the death of Jesus had awakened them to life. Holy rivalry!

He rolled a great stone.—A natural method of closing the mouth of the tomb. "In the Talmud,

* [Not: *Luke*, as the Edinb. edition falsely reads. The English Version renders Mark xv. 43: "Joseph of Arimathea went in *boldly* unto Pilate" (Vulgate: *audacter introivit*); but the Greek is more expressive: τολμήσας εἰσῆλθε, Luther and Lange: *er wagte es*, etc.—P. S.]

† ["*Non pasces in cruce corvos.*" The Jewish custom, on the contrary, was to take down the bodies of the crucified before sunset and to bury them, ἀνασταυρωμένους πρὸ δύντος ἡλίου καθελεῖν καὶ θάπτειν, Joseph. *De Bello Jud.* iv. 5, 2. This shows the superior humanity of the Jewish compared with the boasted Græco-Roman civilization.—P. S.]

* [It is not likely that the body of a crucified person could be laid in a new tomb, ἐν ᾧ οὐδέπω οὐδεὶς ἐτέθη, without the previous consent of the owner. Matthew alone relates that it was Joseph's property, but all the Evangelists mention that it was a *new* tomb. Jerome *in loc.* says that the tomb was new to prevent the enemies from saying that some other person had arisen: "*In novo ponitur monumento, ne post resurrectionem, cæteris corporibus remanentibus, resurrexisse alius fingeretur.*" But not satisfied with this, he adds: "*Potest autem et novum sepulchrum Mariæ virginalem uterum demonstrare.*" Other fathers likewise draw a parallel between the new tomb from which Christ arose to everlasting life, and the Virgin's womb from which He was born to earthly life. Similarily Wordsworth, following the doubtful patristic and scholastic notions of the miraculous birth through the closed womb: "Christ rose from the *new tomb*, without moving away the stone. He, who, as a man entered life through the closed gate of the Virgin's womb, rose to immortality from the sealed sepulchre."—P. S.]

† [From the Gospel narratives concerning the sepulchre of Christ, we may infer with Alford and others: (1) that it was entirely new; (2) that it was near the spot of the crucifixion; (3) that it was not a natural cave, but an artificial excavation in the rock; (4) that it was not cut downward, after the manner of our graves, but horizontally, or nearly so, into the face of the rock. The last seems to be implied, though not necessarily, in προσκυλίσας λίθον μέγαν τῇ θύρᾳ τοῦ μνημείου.—P. S.]

such a piece of rock, employed to shut up a sepulchre, is called גּוֹלֵל, roller."

Ver. 61. **The other Mary.**—She was mentioned in ver. 56, and is the mother of James and Joses, the wife of Alphæus; and Mark (xv. 47) accordingly says, Mary [*the mother*] of Joses, as the best and most codd. read. Codex A. reads there ἡ Ἰωσήφ. Wieseler infers from this reading, without sufficient warrant, that she was the wife or daughter of Joseph of Arimathea.—**Were there sitting.**—It is only Matthew who states this glorious fact; according to Mark, "they beheld where He was laid."

Ver. 62. **That followed the preparation.**—The παρασκευή is the day of preparation for the Sabbath, Friday, on this occasion the first day of the feast; and hence the day which followed was the Sabbath, or Saturday, the second day of the Passover. Wieseler holds the expression was chosen, because the first day might have been called also σάββατον. Meyer says: "The name is explained by the fact, that παρασκευή was the solemn designation in use among the Christians to distinguish the Friday of the crucifixion." It is extremely noteworthy, that the Jews hold a council and hurry to Pilate upon the Sabbath morning, and that too the great Sabbath of the feast. Kuinoel: "*Lex mosaica interdixerat operam manuariam, ut et judicii exercitium, non vero ire ad magistratum, ab eoque petere aliquid, præsertim cum periculum in mora esset.*"

Ver. 63. **After three days.**—De Wette: "Jesus had never declared that openly and before strangers." Still He had told it to the disciples, and not as secret teaching, but to be published. [John ii. 19; Matt. xii. 40.] Probably Judas had given them the more exact statements.

Ver. 65. **Ye have a watch!**—That is: *Ye shall have a watch!* Your petition is granted. Official, and perhaps discontented laconism. But it cannot mean, Ye have yourselves a watch (Grotius), of whom ye may make use, the temple-guards; for that view is opposed to ch. xxviii. 14.

As ye understand.—Not, "as sure as you can;" or, "as appears to you best;" or, "if that is possible;" but, "as ye understand that," according to your meaning of securing. He places the guard at their disposal; the employment of the men, the guardianship or guarantee for Christ's continuance in death, which they wished him also to undertake, that he will leave to themselves; and they are to employ this force to attain the end they had in view, especially the insuring of the tomb as long as it may be necessary. In this instance, again, Pilate kept not his conscience pure, and preserved not his civil power unimpaired,—giving a guard because of a religious question.

Ver. 66. **Sealing the stone.**—A string was stretched across the stone, and sealed to the rock at both ends with wax [upon which was stamped the official seal of Pilate].

The assertion of Meyer, that this sealing of the grave, which Matthew records, belongs to the unhistorical traditions, does not need here a lengthened refutation.* But the following points furnish materials for an answer:—1. Jesus had certainly declared previously, that He would rise upon the third day. 2. The grave might be sealed, without the women coming to know it upon the Sabbath. 3. The Sanhedrists could not have taken the body of Jesus into custody, because Joseph had previously obtained it. Besides, it was their interest to affect carelessness regarding it. 4. The seduction of the guard to give a false testimony, and the silencing of the procurator, correspond in every point to the character of the world; besides, it is not said that the soldiers brought their false report to Pilate, rather the opposite. 5. It is quite natural that Matthew, according to the character of his Gospel, should be the writer to report this historic transaction, as he did the corresponding history of the resurrection, ch. xxviii. 11-15.* It is still less worth while to deal with the assumption of Stroth, that this is an interpolation. This statement simply proves, that the critic could not grasp the meaning of the passage. For the remainder, *see* ch. xxviii. 11.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. Regarding the early occurrence of death in our Lord's case, consult the author's *Leben Jesu*, ii. 8, p. 1619. One of the reasons why death appeared at so early a date, was that the dying body hurried forward to its transformation. To this, the phenomenon, John xix. 34, had already pointed; for the resurrection of Jesus was at once resurrection and glorification. In the death of Jesus, the great mystery of death is glorified.

[Different opinions on the death of Christ: 1. It was His own voluntary act, by which He separated in the full vigor of life His spirit from His body, and placed it, as a deposit, in His Father's keeping. 2. It was the act of God the Father, in answer to the prayer of the Saviour. 3. It was the natural consequence of His physical sufferings, and occurred so early (after six hours, instead of the usual twelve or more of sufferings on the cross), either on account of the extraordinary intensity of His agony of body and mind during the trial in Gethsemane and on Calvary, or by a sudden rupture of the heart. These views may be combined, by supposing that the Saviour *hastened* His death by a voluntary self-surrender which the Father accepted. The passage, John x. 17, 18 should be carefully considered in this connection. The resurrection, too, is represented on the one hand, as Christ's own act, to whom the Father has given to have life in Himself (John ii. 19; v. 26; x. 17, 18; Acts i. 3; Rom. i. 4), and, on the other hand, as the act of His Father (Acts ii. 24, 32; Rom. iv. 24; vi. 4, etc.). Consult on this subject, W. Stroud: *The Physical Cause of Christ's Death*, Lond. 1847; Samuel J. Andrews: *The Life of our Lord upon the Earth*, New York, 1863, p. 550 ff.;

* [I regret to see that Meyer adheres to this view in the fifth edition of his Commentary on Matthew which has just appeared and reached me (Aug. 29, 1864). Otherwise the valuable commentaries of this accurate, honest, and conscientious scholar, which occupy now the first rank among philological or strictly grammatico-historical commentaries, present a steady progress of improvement in every successive edition since they were first begun thirty years ago. The first volume, which appeared in 1832, contained the first three Gospels in one moderate volume and was considered almost rationalistic, the fifth edition of Matthew alone, published in 1864, forms a respectable volume of 628 pages, and is not only much more thorough in a scientific point of view, but also far more decidedly Christian in tone and spirit (compare the touching preface), and much nearer the standpoint of evangelical orthodoxy.—P. S.]

* "Against the opponents of this history, *see* particularly the work of the late, little-known Counsellor Brauer in Karlsruhe: '*Pauleidolon Chroneicon, oder Gedanken eines Südländers über europäische Religionschriften, Aufklärungsschriften*, etc., Christianstadt (*i. e.*, Frankfurt am Main, 1797);" Heubner.

the various Commentators on the Gospels, and *Lange's* profound suggestions in the Doctrinal and Ethical Thoughts to Chap. xxviii. 1–10, nos. 7 and 8.—P. S.]

2. Along with the death of Jesus, the courage of the New Testament confessors begins to manifest itself. To this confessing band belong the sorrowing women who (according to Luke) follow the cross-laden Lord, the centurion beneath the cross, also the two hitherto-secret disciples, Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus. Under this head, also, must we notice the fact, that the two Maries continue sitting alone over against the Lord's tomb, in that awing and affrighting spot.

3. One of the striking ironies of God's judgment may be observed in the circumstance, that the members of the Sanhedrin are forced to go upon the morning of the paschal Sabbath to the sepulchre of Jesus, for the purpose of sealing the stone, because the dead Christ allowed them no rest. In that anxiety we may see the effect of the words of Judas, and of the Lord's prediction of His resurrection. Upon this morning of the feast, it was no formal meeting of council they held: the most decided enemies of Jesus consulted among themselves, and then dropped in singly, as if by accident, to make their request to Pilate: and thus there came to be a kind of priestly council in the governor's palace, to which the Evangelist here alludes. It was alleged by these priests, that the disciples might come and steal away the corpse; and this lying assertion reveals to us, how well prepared they were for any emergency, even the worst. But, beneath all this disguise, they were the prey of fear, and the real motive was terror. Influenced by a monstrous, superstitious belief in the power of the seal of Jewish authority, and of a Roman guard, they imagined themselves able to shut up in the grave the possibility of a resurrection by Jesus, the divine retribution, a result of that resurrection, and, above all, their own wicked fears. And so they desecrate the great Passover Sabbath by their restless occupation, seeking to secure the grave of Him whom they had accused and condemned for His miracles of love wrought on ordinary Sabbaths. The disembodied spirit of the Jewish law must wander around the grave of Jesus upon the most sacred Sabbath of the year. In that act we have the last expression of their abandonment to the Gentiles of salvation through a Messiah; and also the strongest expression of the folly they manifested in their unbelief. By means of a priestly seal, and a borrowed military guard, they desire to secure in a permanent tomb the spirit and life of Christ, the spirit of His past, present, and future, as if all were a mere deception.

4. But in the meantime* the spirit of Christ's life is laboring in the depths of the grave and the under world or Hades. The germ of humanity and salvation was bursting into new life in the earth, and also in the heart of the disciples; in the former, saved from death, in the latter, from apparent despair.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The quiet Sabbath; or, the death-rest of Jesus in its twofold efficacy: 1. It institutes the sabbath of redemption in the disciples' hearts; 2. it institutes the godless labor of wicked fear in the enemies' camp.—How friends and foes are busied about the dead Christ: 1. The friends; 2. the foes.—The revival of the disciples, a presage of His resurrection.—How through Christ's death His secret disciples obtain the power to confess Him openly: 1. Now they feel their full guilt; 2. now they see the world's full condemnation; 3. the perfect vanity and wretchedness of the fear of man; 4. the perfect glory of the sacrificial death of Christ.—Joseph of Arimathea; or, the wonder how, in spite of all, the rich enter the kingdom of heaven.—The sacrifice of Joseph.—The offerings of the male and female disciples.—The Church at the holy sepulchre.—How Christ's love changed the women into heroines, beside the grave.—How the younger disciples meet the older always at Christ's grave.—The Lord's convulsing death, by which lambs become lions like Himself, the Lion of the tribe of Judah.—The import which that evening-seat over against Jesus' grave has for us.—The quiet Sabbath, and the quiet grave.—The burial of believers a sermon.—The grave of Christ amidst all the world's graves: a transfiguration of the same.—The Jewish method of burial in its difference from the heathen sepulchre, a prophecy which has been fulfilled in the grave of Jesus.—The interment of mankind, a picture of their religion,—1. Among the heathen; 2. the Jews; 3. the Christians.—Christ's grave has changed the impure Jewish grave into a consecrated Christian grave.—The isolated graves of Judaism, and the Christian churchyard; or, the sleeping are gathered together by Christ.—Gethsemane, and the holy sepulchre; or, the garden of struggle converted into the garden of rest.—Paradise and the accursed earth, Golgotha and the garden of the grave and the resurrection; or, the old and the new world.—Priests and Pharisees in their ever-abiding dread of Christ, whom they imagined they have killed.—The means by which the slaves of the letter think to imprison in the grave the spirit and life of Christ: 1. Cunning pretences; 2. antiquated seals of authority; 3. borrowed guards.—The illusion which the foes of Jesus make of the truth of His life and efficacy: 1. The illusion: (*a*) they make Christ a lie; (*b*) a destructive lie; (*c*) a double deception. 2. The result of this illusion: (*a*) they become deceptive opponents of His life; (*b*) of His redemption; (*c*) of His resurrection.—How the old Sabbath fanatics desecrate the second, the great Sabbath of God.—They went and secured the grave with guards, and sealed the stone.—The old yet ever-new history: legalism becomes the servant of the kingdom of darkness.—The self-annihilation of the authority of the old world, making itself the minister of the Wicked One: 1. The self-annihilation of the power of the church-seal (the bull); 2. the self-annihilation of the power of the soldiery (in conflict with the Spirit of Christ).—The sacred corn-field upon Golgotha, between Good Friday and Easter.—Christ is dead to live for ever,—1. In the heart of God; 2. in the depths of His life; 3. in the bosom of humanity; 4. in the centre of our hearts.

Starke:—As God watched over His Son, and revealed His care visibly, so will He guard and take care of Christ's members (in death).—*Canstein:* Riches and a high position are undoubtedly accompanied with dangers; 1 Cor. i. 26; yet God has his own among the noble and wealthy, 1 Kings xviii. 12, 13.—He who employs his wealth to God's glory (upon Christ's body, His Church, servants, members), has made a good investment.—*Bibl. Wirt.:* In the most bitter persecutions, and greatest apostasy, there are many steadfast disciples who confess Christ and serve Him

* [Not; *in spite of all*, as the Edinb. edition mistranslates *unterdessen*.—P. S.]

—*Nova Bibl. Tub.:* Faith grows in trial; and he who acknowledged Christ but secretly during His life, dared to solicit Him boldly after His death.—*Osiander:* Those often become cowardly and despairing, who were at first bold and fearless; and *vice versa.*—*Cramer:* God's Spirit is mighty and wonderful, and can quickly make a heart where there is none.—God often draws out the hearts of the high to glorify Himself, and rejoice his people.—*Osiander:* We should bury our dead honorably, and testify in this way openly, that we believe in the resurrection of the dead.—*Zeisius:* The burial of Christ, the rest of our bodies.—The guard, and the sealing of the grave, must become testimonies to the resurrection.—Wilt thou do good to Christ, do it to His people.—We may still show love to Christ in the persons of His poor members.—True love loves still, after death.—True faith never lets Christ escape; if faith sees Him not with the eyes, still she keeps him, His cross and death, in her heart.—*Quesnel:* Death cannot extinguish a friendship which God's Spirit has instituted, and Christ's blood has cemented.—The will's extreme wickedness has united to itself extreme blindness of perception (in so far as they sought by a foolish proposal to remove the truth of the resurrection, while they only served to confirm it).—The wicked are like the restless sea, their evil conscience gives them no rest, Isa. lvii. 20, 21.—*Zeisius:* No human power, prudence, or cunning, can hinder God's work, Ps. xxv. 3.—The issue was a condemnation of themselves, and a glorification of Christ.

Heubner:—By Joseph's example we are taught to honor the dead, especially when we had known them. —The body, too, is to be honored: it is the garment of the soul.—Many hands were employed in burying Christ, and with what tenderness and love!—Christ's rest in the grave, the type of the soul's spiritual sabbath.—Tarry lovingly by the graves of your loved ones.—Whosoever loves Jesus, is lost in the contemplation of His death.—Teach thyself to bury thy life in Jesus.—They wish to prevent His resurrection, and they must establish unwillingly its certainty; at the outset they proclaim the secret of the resurrection, and, permitting their knowledge of the true meaning of the "destruction of the temple" to appear, they punish themselves thus for a false accusation.—As often as a man strives against God, against the truth, he strives against himself, and prepares shame and difficulties for himself.—The more men seek to bury the memory of the truth, the more it appears.—In their slanders, men give the key to their discovery and detection.

Braune:—Who had believed that any one would have come now to the cross? But, behold, two rich men come, members of that Sanhedrin which had rejected Christ!—Their hearts forced them; they acted under the impulse of a new spirit.—The fear of man is overcome.—The new grave, in which no man had been laid; as He rode into Jerusalem upon an unused colt. And shall His Spirit make His abode in an old heart?—The friends who acknowledged the Lord when covered with shame, are the Christian types of those who believe in virtue when all the world ridicules it.—The guards have one object in common with the friends of Jesus, that the bodies be not changed, and that so the resurrection be all the more certain.—The disciples forget the words of Jesus regarding the resurrection, His enemies remember them (Reason: the sorrow of the one, the fear of the others).—They would prevent a deception, and they themselves practise a deception.—These liars and murderers fear the disciples are liars. —What is done in God's strength and spoken in His Spirit, appears to view and stands fast.

Gerok:—The sacred evening—stillness upon Golgotha: 1. The quiet rest of the perfected Endurer. 2. The quiet repentance of the convulsed world. 3. The quiet labor of the loving friends. 4. The quiet peace of the holy grave.—*Kuntze:*—The burial of Jesus manifests to us,—1. The believer's courage; 2. love's power; 3. truth's seal; 4. the mourner's consolation.—*Wolf:*—Looks of comfort toward the grave of Christ.—*Brandt:*—The burial of Jesus Christ,—a work of, 1. Grateful acknowledgment; 2. holy love; 3. praiseworthy courage; 4. a work causing the deepest shame to many.

PART SEVENTH.

Christ in the Perfection of His Kingly Glory.

Chapter XXVIII.

UPON MATTHEW'S ACCOUNT OF THE RESURRECTION.

The relation of this Gospel of the Resurrection to the whole evangelical tradition is to be seen only after a brief sketch of the latter.

I. The Appearances in Judæa, in Jerusalem, at Emmaus, belong to the Period of the Israelitish Passover.

1. *The first Easter* morning.*—Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James, and Salome, proceed to the grave, Mark xvi. 1. They are to be followed (*see* Luke) by the other women, who are bringing the spices and ointments. The three who thus went in advance, behold the stone rolled away, and are affected in quite different ways by this sight. The narrative now divides into two portions.

Excitement and ecstasy seize upon Mary Magdalene.—She hurries into the city (*and toward the male disciples*), reports the facts to Peter and John; hurries back again, sees two angels in the grave, and afterward the Lord. She brings then the message to the disciples. Meanwhile Peter and John have arrived at the grave, and found it empty.

Mary, the mother of James, and Salome, at the sight of the removed stone, collect themselves, advance more closely, and see *one angel* sitting upon the stone. The Easter message of the angel. They hurry back in great fear and joy (*and toward the female disciples*), long undecided whether they will announce what they had seen or not. And, in this state, they meet the other women, who are bringing the ointments. All together now visit the empty tomb of Jesus, where they now (*see* Luke) behold *two angels*, as the Magdalene had done before (*see* the author's *Commentary on Mark*). After they had started back to the city, they were met by the Lord.

Besides, in the course of the day, Peter also had a manifestation. Hence three messages from the risen Saviour—three messages from the empty grave.

2. *The first Easter evening.*—Christ appears to the two disciples going to Emmaus (Luke), walks with them, goes into the house, and then disappears. Next He appears in Jerusalem in their *evening meeting, on which occasion Thomas is absent.*
3. *The second Sunday* (*eight days after the first Easter morning*).—Appearance in the evening among the disciples. Revelation of the Lord specially for Thomas (*see* John). The feast of the Passover continued till the preceding Friday. The disciples would not, of course, set out upon Saturday, or Sabbath. They remained also the second Sunday,† which shows that it had become to them already a *second* (a *Christian*) *sabbath*, and that they waited on that holy day for the full assurance of the fact of the resurrection to the doubting disciple (Thomas). Probably Monday following was the day of their departure.

II. The Appearances in Galilee, during the Return of the Galileans, between Easter and Pentecost.

1. The appearance at the Sea of Galilee unto the seven disciples (John xxi.). Peter's restoration. The declaration of the future fate of Peter and John in their import for the Church.

* [In German: *Ostermorgen*, and below, sub 2., *Osterabend*. The Edinb. edition substitutes for these terms *morning after the Sabbath*, and *evening after the Sabbath*, and studiously avoids throughout the whole section the mention of *Easter* (the Christian resurrection-feast) altogether or substitutes for it the Jewish *passover*, which had now lost its meaning for the Christians; the shadow having disappeared in the substance.—P. S.]

† [Not: *Sabbath*, as the Edinb. translation here and elsewhere translates *Sonntag*, even where Lange uses Sabbath in the Jewish sense as in the sentence immediately preceding. By substituting Sabbath in this passage the Edinb. edition simply repeats the preceding sentence, and by omitting the sentences which follow altogether, it withholds from the reader an argument for the apostolic origin of the observance of Sunday as the Christian Sabbath.—P. S.]

2. The great revelation of Jesus in the circle of His disciples upon the mountain in Galilee (Matt. xxviii. 16 ff.; Mark xvi. 15–18; Luke xxiv. 45–49; 1 Cor. xv. 6).
3. The special appearance to James. Probably it was not (as the tradition says) to James the Less, but to the Elder: and the object, probably, was to direct the disciples through James to go up to Jerusalem earlier than usual.

III. The Appearances in Jerusalem and on Mount Olivet, about the Time of Pentecost.

The history of the Ascension (Mark, Luke, the Acts). We reckon, accordingly, five manifestations upon the first day of Easter,* the sixth upon the following Sunday. The two great and decisive appearances in Galilee, forming the centre, are the seventh and eighth. Then the appearance to James, also without doubt in Galilee. And finally the tenth, which closed with the Ascension.

We must notice this distinction, that in the first five instances Jesus appeared unexpectedly and suddenly, and as quickly vanished. But, for the second grand revelation upon the mountain in Galilee, He issued a formal invitation, and in all probability tarried some time in their midst; and this holds true, apparently, of the last interview, when He walked along so confidingly among His Apostles, from Jerusalem to Bethany, that they might have thought He would now remain with them always.

[The order of the events after the resurrection given by Dr. Lange is very ingenious and plausible. For other arrangements of Lightfoot, Lardner, West, Townson, Newcome, Da Costa, Greswell, Ebrard, Robinson, *see* the convenient tables in Andrews: *Life of Christ*, pp. 587–592. Also Nast: *Commentary on Matthew and Mark*, pp. 629–632. If anywhere in the history of our Saviour, we must look for differences of statement in this most wonderful and mysterious period of the forty days, which deals with facts that transcend all ordinary Christian experience. Our inability to harmonize the narratives satisfactorily in every particular, arises naturally from our want of knowledge of all the details and circumstances in the precise order of their occurrence, and proves nothing against the facts themselves. On the contrary, minor differences with substantial agreement, tend strongly to confirm those facts, far more than a literal agreement, which might suggest the suspicion of a previous understanding and mutual dependence of the witnesses.—P. S.]

* [Here again the Edinb. edition translates *am ersten Ostertage: the first day after the Sabbath*, which must mean the *Jewish* sabbath, and yet in the same sentence immediately afterward it uses *Sabbath* (for *Sonntag*) in the *Christian* sense, without a word of explanation to prevent the inevitable confusion.—P. S.]

Of the rich treasury of these evangelical traditions, Matthew has given us merely the first angelic appearance, seen at the grave by the women, Christ's revelation to these females, and the appearance of the Lord among His disciples upon the mountain in Galilee. But he has, besides this, introduced into his narrative the account of the bribery of the sepulchral guards (vers. 11–15). This last record, and also Christ's majestic revelation, are peculiar to him. —It is manifestly his chief design to depict Christ's royal majesty, as revealed by a few decisive transactions. In addition to this, it is his chief interest to make the contrast between the Lord's kingly glory and the Messianic expectations on the part of the Jews, appear now most distinctly (as this wish may have been his reason for continually designating the New Testament kingdom of God, the kingdom of heaven). Hence he places the scene of the most important events in the resurrection-history in Galilee. Galilee was the place to which the disciples were pointed by the angels (ver. 7). In Galilee the Lord Himself bade His brethren assemble. Accordingly, it is in Galilee that the chief revelation occurs, during which Christ proclaims His share in the world's government, institutes holy baptism, and promises His ever-abiding presence in the Church till the end of the world.

All these points are no doubt to be found in the general evangelical history; but it is Matthew who brings them out most strongly, and contrasts them with the chiliastic views of the Jews, who refused to dissever the glory of the Messiah from the external Zion and the external temple. For the same reason, Matthew directs attention to the contrast between the deep misery of unbelieving Judaism, as presented in the narrative of the bribed guards, and the glorious certainty of believing Judaism, in beholding the revelation of the Lord upon the mountain, when He presented Himself in the brightness of His omnipotence, and of the holy Trinity, and instituted as victor His victorious Church. The first section is an expressive type of the Talmud and its supporters, of Judaism sunken in deceit, employed in futile endeavors, and making common cause with heathendom; while the second is a type of the Gospel and the world-conquering Church.

From the brevity and elevated conception that characterize the account given by Matthew, we must expect, however, several inaccuracies. Hence it is that the two reports brought by the women are woven into one; and the second vision of angels, seen by Mary Magdalene, is united with the first, which the other women had beheld. The same is the case regarding the two distinct appearances of Christ to the women. Matthew agrees with John in not stating that the design of the women was to anoint the Lord. This omission was probably intentional. Undoubtedly, the ostensible object of the women was to anoint Christ's body; but, at the same time, a higher motive, of which they were themselves but darkly con-

scious, drove them to the grave,—the germ of hope, that Jesus will arise, which His promises necessarily produced. This supposition gains some ground from the free, general account, found in Matthew and John, omitting as they do all mention of the anointing. When dealing with the self-manifestation of Jesus upon the mountain, where there were more than five hundred believers witnessing His glory, Matthew mentions only the Eleven, because it was his intention to conclude his Gospel with the apostolic commission which the heavenly King issued to the world, putting it first into the hands of His Apostles, and sealing it unto them with His promise.

The imaginary and real differences between the various accounts of the circumstances of Christ's resurrection found in the four Gospels, have been pointed out by the Wolfenbüttel Fragmentist [Reimarus], and exaggerated beyond all the limits of historical justice by Strauss, as if they were as many irreconcilable contradictions. As opposed to his views, consult, in addition to the older harmonists, THOLUCK upon *John;* HUG, *Gutachten*, ii. p. 210; W. HOFFMANN, p. 408 ff.; NEANDER, *Life of Christ*, p. 771; EBRARD, *Criticism of the Gospel History*, p. 712 ff. A short resumé of the most striking differences will be found in DE WETTE'S Commentary on *Matthew*, p. 244 ff.

One of the most important differences Strauss finds in this, that Jesus commands the disciples, according to Matthew and Mark, to go into Galilee to see Him; while Luke represents Him as issuing the command not to depart from Jerusalem till they should be gifted with power from on high. But this is merely an apparent contradiction. Strauss has overlooked the real state of matters, and has quite forgotten the relations in which Galilean visitors stood to the Jewish feasts of the Passover and of Pentecost. When Jesus had risen, the Passover was almost at an end. Jesus revealed Himself, it is true, at that time and place to the Eleven; but He delayed His appearance to the Church until He arrived in Galilee, partly because He wished not to expose them to the persecution of the hierarchy in Jerusalem in their young faith in the resurrection,* partly because He wished to remove from the disciples every idea of His manifestation being necessarily connected with the old temple. But it may be easily conceived that the disciples would not lightly leave the scene where Jesus had first revealed Himself, namely, Jerusalem; and that this supposition is true, is proved by the fact, that they tarried still two days after the close of the Passover (which lasted a whole week) for the sake of Thomas, who still doubted, and many others of the larger circle of disciples, who probably doubted with him [comp. ch. xxviii. 17]. On this account, the command of the Lord comes, enjoining them to prepare for their departure. Besides, some of the disciples required some time to prepare themselves for the joy of seeing Him,—especially the mother of Jesus. Accordingly, after that they became convinced of the certainty of His resurrection, they returned homeward, according to their old festive habits. At the time of the Ascension, however, or toward the end of the forty days, the period for going up to the feast of Pentecost was at hand; and on this occasion they were induced, it would appear, to depart at an unusually early date. There is probably a connection between this earlier departure and Christ's appearance to James. (*See* the author's *Leben Jesu*, ii. 3, 1761.)

The differences, however, between the accounts of the first announcement of the resurrection, found in the four Gospels, are an important testimony, when exactly weighed, to the truth of the history of the resurrection. It is no doubt remarkable, that literal, or external, protocol-like certainty, should be wanting, exactly in the place where the Christian faith seeks and does actually find the beginning of the confirmation of all its certainties. Faith, even here, is not to be supported upon the letter, but upon the substance,—upon the real essence of the facts. This essence, this spirit, comes out here most distinctly, and is manifested exactly through the differences themselves, because these are the indications of the extraordinary effect produced by the resurrection upon the band of the disciples. The evangelical records give no narration of facts, simply for the sake of the facts, and apart from their effects; but they present us with a history, which has individualized itself to the view of the Evangelist. And hence the Easter occurrences are retained and rehearsed as reminiscences never to be forgotten; and differ accordingly, as the stand-points of the disciples vary, and yet preserve a great degree of harmony. In this way it is that we are to explain the remarkable individualities and variations to be found in the accounts of the resurrection and manifestations of the risen Saviour; and in these accounts is contained for all time the joyous fright of the Church, caused by the great tidings of the resurrection. Just as, in a festive *motetto*, the voices are apparently singing in confusion, seemingly separate, and contradict another, while in reality they are bringing out one theme in a higher and holier harmony; so is it here. The one Easter history, with its grand unity, meets, when all the different accounts are combined, the eye in all its clearness and distinctness. The answer to each of the seeming contradictions is to be found in the organic construction which has been attempted above.

LITERATURE.—*See* WINER: *Handbuch der theolog. Literatur*, i. p. 291; DANZ: *Universal-Wörterbuch*, p. 91; *Supplemente*, p. 11; GÖSCHEL: *Von den Beweisen für die Unsterblichkeit der menschlichen Seele im Lichte der speculativen Philosophie*, 1835 (see the Preface); DOEDES: *De Jesu in vitam reditu*. Utr. 1841; REICH: *Die Auferstehung Jesu Christi als Heilsthatsache*, 1846; HASSE: *Das Leben des verklärten Erlösers im Himmel nach den eignen Aussprüchen des Herrn, ein Beitrag zur biblischen Theologie*, Leipzig, 1854; W. F. BESSER: *Die Leidens- und Herrlichkeitsgeschichte nach den 4 Evangelisten in Bibelstunden für die Gemeinde ausgelegt.* Second Part: *Die Herrlichkeitsgeschichte*, 4th ed., Halle, 1857; SCHRADER: *Der Verkehr des Auferstandenen mit den Seinen, fünf Betrachtungen*, Kiel, 1857. The article, *Auferstehung*, by KLING, in HERZOG'S *Real-Encyklopädie* [vol. i. p. 592 ff. Among English works we refer to ROBINSON: *Harmony*, and ANDREWS: *Life of our Lord*, p. 570 ff.—P. S.].

Easter (German, *Ostern*).—The name. "The month of April is called, up to this day, Eastermonth (*Ostermonat*); and as early as Eginhart we

* [Literally: *Easter-faith*, *Osterglaube*, which the Edinb. edition, in its unreasonable opposition to the term *Easter*, renders: *Passover-faith*, which is bad English and conveys a false meaning by obliterating the distinction between the typical shadow of the Jewish passover and the substance of the Christian resurrection-festable. So further below the Edinb. edition has *Passover-occurrences*, *Passover-transactions*, *Passover-history*, and similar heavy compounds to avoid *Easter*.—P. S.]

find *Ostermanoth.* The holy festable of the Christians, which is celebrated generally in April, or toward the close of March, bears, in the oldest remains of the old High German dialect, the name *ôstarâ;* generally the plural form is found, because two Easter-days were observed. This *ôstarâ* must, like the Anglo-Saxon *Eástre*, have been the name for some superior being among the heathen, whose worship had struck its roots so deep, that the name was retained and applied to one of the chief festivals of the Christian year. All our neighboring nations have retained the name *Pascha;* even Ulfilas has *paska*, not *austro*, although he must have been familiar with the term, exactly as the northern languages introduce *påskis* (Swedish), *pask*, and the Danish *paaske.* The old High German adverb *ôstar* indicates the *east;* so the old Norse *austr*, probably the Anglo-Saxon *eástor*, Gothic *austr.* In the Latin tongue, the quite identical *auster* indicates the south. In the *Edda*, a male being, a spirit of light, bears the name *Austri;* while the High German and Saxon stem have formed but one *Ostara.*—*Ostara, Eastre*, may accordingly have been the god of the beaming morning, of the rising light, a joyful, blessing-bringing appearance, whose conception could easily be employed to designate the resurrection-festival of the Christian's God. Joyous bonfires were kindled at Easter; and, according to the myth long believed by the people, the sun made, early upon the morning of the first Easter-day, three springs for joy,—a festive dance of gladness." JACOB GRIMM, *Deutsche Mythologie*, p. 247. So also BEDA VEN., *De temporum ratione:* "*A dea illorum* (*veterum Anglorum*) *quæ Eostre vocabatur.*" The other explanation, held to by many, that the name comes from the Germanic *urstan*, = *to rise*, must yield to this historical etymology. The similarity of *auster* goes no further than the mere sound; but, on the other hand, the Greek name for the morning-red, and for the east, ἠώς, Doric ἀώς, Æolic αὐώς, is to be connected. The transference of the heathen name is explained by the fact, that a popular festival was united with the day of the god of light among the heathen, as with the celebration of the resurrection among the Christians. The *people's* festival, not that of the *god*, was transferred. It became a christianized national festival, retaining the old name; and this occurred all the more easily, because the name signified rather a religious personification than a chief divinity of heathenism, and the celebration of the name symbolized fully the Christian holy day. Just as the festival of the returning (unconquered) sun, as a festival of joy, became united in symbolic import with the Christian festival of Christmas, so the festival of the spring sun, and of the life-fraught morning glow, coming forth in spring out from the winter storms, became a symbolic celebration of the spiritual Easter Sun, which rose out of the night of the grave.

The day of preparation for the Easter festival in the ancient Church was the great or sacred Sabbath (*Sabbatum magnum*), and was observed as a general fast. The afternoon of that day was a period for a general administration of baptism. In the evening there was an illumination in the towns; and the congregation assembled for the Easter vigils (παννυχίδες), and these lasted till Easter morning. Upon Easter Sunday (τὸ πάσχα, κυριακὴ μεγάλη), the Christians greeted one another with mutual blessings; and the day was signalized by works of benevolence and charity. Easter Monday was the second celebration, as the festival of their unhesitating belief in the resurrection; but the Easter holydays, in the wider sense, did not conclude till the next Sunday (*Dominica in albis*), which derived its name from the custom of leading those who had been baptized into the church in their white baptismal garments. A new part of the entire quinquagesimal festival began with Ascension Sunday, and closed with the feast of Pentecost, which resembled the Easter festival.—Upon the Easter festival (*Osterfest*), compare FR. STRAUSS:* *Das evang. Kirchenjahr*, p. 218; BOBERTAG: *Das evang. Kirchenjahr*, ii. p. 155. Strauss: "The Easter festival is the chief Christian festival. It is not simply chief feast, but *the feast*, coming round in its full glory but once in the year, but yet appearing in some form in all the other holy days, and constituting their sacredness. Every holyday, yea, even every Sunday, was called for this reason *dies paschalis.* Easter is the *original* festival in the most comprehensive sense. No one can tell when the festival arose; it arose with the Church, and the Church with it."

* [Court preacher and professor of practical theology in the university of Berlin, died 1862, a man of altogether different spirit from his namesake of *Leben Jesu* notoriety.—P. S.]

FIRST SECTION.

THE ANGEL FROM HEAVEN AND THE FAITHFUL WOMEN. THE RISEN SAVIOUR AND THE FAITHFUL WOMEN. THE WATCHWORD: "INTO GALILEE!"

CHAPTER XXVIII. 1-10.

(Mark xvi. 1-11; Luke xxiv. 1-22; John xx. 1-18.)

1 In the end of the [Jewish] sabbath [Now after the sabbath, ὀψὲ τῶν σαββάτων],[1] as
it began to dawn toward the first *day* of the [festal] week [εἰς μίαν σαββάτων, *i. e.*, the
Christian Sunday],[2] came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to see the sepulchre.
2 And, behold, there was a great earthquake: for the [an] angel of the Lord[3] descended

3 from heaven, and came and rolled back the stone from the door,[4] and sat upon it. His
4 countenance was like lightning, and his raiment white as snow: And for fear of him
5 the keepers did shake, and became as dead *men*. And the angel answered and said
unto the women, Fear not ye: for I know that ye seek Jesus, which [who] was crucified.
6 He is not here: for he is risen, as he said. Come, see the place where the Lord lay.
7 And go quickly, and tell his disciples that he is risen from the dead; and, behold, he
8 goeth before you into Galilee; there shall ye see him: lo, I have told you. And they
departed[5] quickly from the sepulchre with fear and great joy; and did run [and ran] to
9 bring his disciples word.[6] And as they went to tell his disciples,[7] behold, Jesus met
them, saying, All hail. And they came and held him by the feet, and worshipped
10 him. Then said Jesus unto them, Be not afraid: go tell my brethren that they go
into Galilee, and there shall they see me.

[1] Ver. 1.—[The usual translation of ὀψὲ (*sero*) σαββάτων is: *toward the end of the sabbath*, or *late in the sabbath*, meaning the closing period near the end, but still during the sabbath; comp. ὀψὲ τῆς ἡμέρας, *late in the day*, ὀψὲ τῆς ἡλικίας, *late in life*. Vulgate: *vespere sabbati;* Beza: *extremo sabbato;* Tyndale: *the sabbath day at even;* Coverdale: *upon the evening of the sabbath holy day;* Cranmer, Genevan, and Bishops' Versions: *In the latter end of the sabbath day;* Lange: *um die Endezeit des Sabbaths;* Meyer, Alford, Conant, etc. But in this case we must assume with Meyer, Lange, and Alford, that Matthew here follows the natural division of the day from sunrise to sunrise, which seems to be favored by the following definition of time, but which is contrary to the Jewish habit and the Jewish-Christian character and destination of the first Gospel. Ὀψέ, with the genitive, may also mean *after* or *long after*, like ὀψὲ τῶν βασιλέως χρόνων (Plutarch. *Num.* 1), or ὀψὲ μυστηρίων, *when the mysteries were over* (Philostrat. *Vit. Apoll.* iv. 18). Hence Olshausen, de Wette, Ewald, Bleek, Campbell, Norton, Robinson (sub ὀψέ, No. 2), Crosby translate: *nach Verfluss des Sabbaths, Sabbath being over*, or *being ended*, *after the sabbath* (also the French Version: *après le sabbat*). Euthym. Zigabenus, Grotius, Stier, and Wieseler translate: *at the end of the week;* also Greswell, who translates: *Now late in the week, at the hour of dawn, against the first day of the week;* for the plural σάββατα, like the Hebrew שַׁבָּתוֹת, means a *week* as well as a *sabbath* or *sabbaths*, comp. Mark xvi. 2; Luke xxiv. 1; John xx. 1, 19, and Matt. xxviii. 1. It is certain and agreed on all hands that Matthew means the time after the close of the *Jewish* sabbath, the time before day-break on the first day of the week or the Christian Sunday. This is plain from the following τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ εἰς μίαν σαββάτων, and confirmed by the parallel passages; comp. διαγενομένου τοῦ σαββάτου, Mark xvi. 1; τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων ὄρθρου βαθέος, Luke xxiv. 1; and τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων πρωΐ, σκοτίας ἔτι οὔσης, John xx. 1.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 1.—[Lit.: *at the dawning*, or *as it was dawning into the first day of the week* (Conant), or: *in the dawn of the first day* (Norton), *i. e.*, toward sunrise of Sunday. In connection with τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ supply ἡμέρᾳ or ὥρᾳ. The term μία σαββάτων agrees with the Rabbinical signification of the days of the week: אחד בשבת, *Sunday;* שני בשבת, *Monday;* שלישי בשבת, *Tuesday*, etc. *See* Lightfoot, p. 500. As σάββατα in the second clause certainly means *week* and not the sabbath *day*, it seems natural to understand it the same way in the first clause, as Grotius, Wieseler, and Stier, who renders: *Als aber die Woche um war und der erste Wochentag anbrechen wollte.*—P. S.]

[3] Ver. 2.—[The definite article before *angel* is not justified by the Greek: ἄγγελος κυρίου, and suggests a false interpretation as if a particular angel, the angel of the covenant, was meant. In ch. ii. 19 all English Versions correctly render: *an angel*, but in ch. i. 20, 24; ii. 18, and here, they follow Tyndale in prefixing the article.—P. S.]

[4] Ver. 2.—The words: ἀπὸ τῆς θύρας, are wanting in B., D., and rejected by other authorities; probably, an exegetical addition. [They are also omitted in Cod. Sinait., ancient versions, and fathers, and thrown out by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer, and Alford.—P. S.]

[5] Ver. 8.—B., C., L., etc., and Tischendorf, read, instead of ἐξελθοῦσαι, ἀπελθοῦσαι; and, judging from internal grounds, this is the more probable reading. [Cod. Sinait. sustains ἀπελθοῦσαι, which is also adopted by Alford, while Lachmann retains ἐξελθοῦσαι. The latter: they *went out*, would imply that the women had entered into the sepulchre, to "the place where the Lord lay."—P. S.]

[6] Ver. 8.—[In Greek: ἀπαγγεῖλαι. This verb is translated in three different ways in the English Version in this section: *to bring word*, ver. 8; *to tell*, vers. 9, 10; and *to shew*, in ver. 11. Such frequent change is hardly justifiable, certainly unnecessary, since *tell* would answer as well in all these cases.—P. S.]

[7] Ver. 9.—The words: *as they went to tell his disciples*, are omitted in B., D., and many other MSS. and versions. Griesbach and Scholz would insert, Lachmann and Tischendorf omit. Meyer considers the words an explanatory gloss. [Cod. Sinait., Origen, Chrysostom, etc., and of critical editors, Mill, Bengel, Alford, and Tregelles, likewise favor the omission. Scrivener is wrong when he asserts that "Lachmann alone dares to expunge them." Meyer and Alford correctly observe that ὡς ἐπορεύοντο is foreign to the usage of Matthew. It is certain that the words can be easily spared; yet on the other hand, they are solemn, and their omission can be readily explained from homœotel., the recurrence of αὐτοῦ.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1. **But about the end.**—Ὀψὲ δὲ σαββάτων. The peculiar expression is explained by the context. It was the time of the dawn, or of breaking day (ἡμέρᾳ to be supplied in connection with ἐπιφωσκούσῃ), on the first day of the week, Sunday. Similar are the statements of Luke and John; while Mark says: about sunrise. But there are various explanations attached to this expression of Matthew.*

* [Comp. the translator's Critical Note No. 1 above.—P. S.]

1. De Wette and others explain: *After the Sabbath had ended;* 2. Grotius and others: *After the week had closed;* 3. Meyer: *Late upon the Sabbath.* So that it is not the accurate Jewish division of time, according to which the Sabbath ended at six on Saturday evening, but the ordinary reckoning of the day, which extends from sunrise to sunrise, and adds the night to the preceding day. Meyer's assertion, that ὀψέ, with the genitive of the time, always points to a still continuing period as a *late* season, would support this view, if it were true, but it is doubtful.* Pape translates the ὀψὲ τῶν Τρωϊκῶν

* [Meyer, in the fourth and fifth editions of his Commen-

found in Philostr.: "long after the Trojan war." But the fact, that Matthew makes the first day of the week begin here with sunrise, is decisive in Meyer's favor.—Μία σαββάτων = אחד בשבת, *Sunday.* According to Matthew's method of expression, which is always so full of meaning, we find a doctrinal emphasis in the words, *late in the evening of the* (old) *Sabbath season,* as it *began to dawn toward the early morning of the* (new) *Sunday season.*

Came Mary Magdalene, and the other Mary.—John names only Mary Magdalene; Mark adds Salome; Luke (xxiv. 10), several others, namely, Johanna, the wife of Chusa, as we learn from Luke viii. 3. These differences of the narrations arise from the intention of emphasizing different circumstances. We must begin with Mark. Three women go first to the grave—Magdalene, the other Mary, and Salome. Matthew omits Salome, because he intends to continue his account of the two women, Magdalene and Mary (xxvii. 61). John keeps only Magdalene before his eye, because she is seized with excitement on finding the stone rolled away, and, hurrying away alone to the city, calls the two disciples; and because he wishes to relate this circumstance and Magdalene's succeeding history. Luke's attention was occupied chiefly with the women who were bringing the spices and ointments, and accordingly writes of the second body of females, who followed the first three. Meyer maintains that it is impossible to harmonize the different accounts. A judicious critic will, however, only oppose a *forced* harmony.

To see the sepulchre.—Luke and Mark: to anoint the corpse. We have already seen that the women went in two parties to the grave; and those who brought the ointments came second; the first came for information. This hurrying on before the others is explained by fear, unconscious hopes of a resurrection, longing and impatient desire.

Ver. 2. **And, behold, there was** (ἐγένετο) **a great earthquake.**—Meyer: "It is quite arbitrary to take the aorist in the sense of the pluperfect (Castalio, Kuinoel, Kern, Ebrard, etc.), or to make ἦλθε signify an unfinished action (de Wette)." But arbitrary, also, is the hypothesis, that the women must have seen all. The earthquake was felt by them as well as by all the disciples; the angel was beheld by Mary and Salome, sitting upon the stone rolled away, and perhaps also by the affrighted guard; but that which occurred between, the rolling away of the stone, etc., could have been supplied by the Apostle's prophetic intuition. The resurrection of the Lord itself was not a matter of actual bodily vision. "The old and general view (*see* especially the Fathers, as quoted by Calovius) is, that Jesus rose while the grave was still closed, and that the tomb was opened merely to prove the resurrection." * Meyer. But this is rather an arbitrary and supernatural separation of the occurrences.*

Ver. 5. **Fear not ye,** ὑμεῖς.—Opposed to the terror of the guard, whose fear might have caused them to be filled with wonder. Meyer gives these words their correct explanation, pointing out the false interpretation which had been made of ὑμεῖς.†

[Ver. 6.—Hilary: "Through woman death was first introduced into the world; to woman the first announcement was made of the resurrection. Chrysostom: Observe how our Lord elevates the weaker sex, which had fallen into dishonor through the transgression of Eve; and how He inspires it with hope, and heals its sorrows, and makes women the messengers of glad tidings to His disciples.]

For I know.—The reason why they need not fear.

Ver. 7. **Tell His disciples.**—The Galilean believers, who formed the great body of the disciples, are intended by this term. Though the Lord revealed Himself to a few women, to the disciples of Emmaus, and to the twelve in Judea, His grand self-manifestation took place in Galilee (ver. 16). Bengel: *Verba discipulis dicenda se porrigunt usque ad: videbitis.*—**Lo, I have told you,** Εἶπον, which marks the formal and important announcement. Corroborative: *dixi.*—Unnecessary subtilties in the explanation of these words are referred to by Meyer.

Ver. 8. **With fear and great joy.**—Mingled feelings. The transition from the dread felt by the women to the blessedness of belief in the resurrection, which they now began to experience, is expressed by this statement; also the final passage from the Old to the New Testament, from the horror of Sheol to the view of the opening heavens. "Corresponding cases of the union of fear and joy are mentioned by Wetstein (Virg. *Æneid,* 1, 514; 11, 807, etc.)." Meyer.

Ver. 9. **Held Him by the feet.**—This is not merely an expression of consternation, although the words μὴ φοβεῖσθε, ver. 10, point to such a feeling of dread, but it describes rather the highest joy and their adoration. It is the climax of the feeling alluded to in ver. 8. Bengel: "*Jesum ante passionem alii potius alienores adorarunt, quam discipuli.*" The special experience of Mary Magdalene is incorporated with the vision of the two other women.

tary, admits that ὀψέ, *sero*, with genitive (which occurs nowhere else in the N. T.), means also: *lange nach, long after*, and quotes Plut. *Num.* 1; but the *length* of time is not necessarily implied, comp. ὀψὲ μυστηρίων, *after the mysteries*, in Philostratus. *Vita Apoll.* iv. 18.—P. S.]

* [So Ambrose, Chrysostom, Jerome, and Augustine. The fathers compare the resurrection from the closed tomb to the birth of Christ from the closed womb of the Virgin, *ut ex clauso Virginis utero natus, sic ex clauso sepulchro resurrexit in quo nemo conditus fuerat, et postquam resurrexisset se per clausas fores in conspectum apostolorum induxit* (Greg. M.). *See* the quotation from Jerome in the translator's note on ch. xxvii. 60, p. 536. The orthodox Protestant commentators likewise assume generally that the resurrection took place before the stone was rolled away.—P. S.]

* [The Edinb. edition translates *supernaturalistische* by *unnatural.* But every tyro in divinity ought to know the essential difference between *supernatural* or *superrational, i. e.*, what is *above* nature and *above* reason (as is every miracle and specific doctrine of Christianity), and *unnatural* or *irrational, i. e.*, what is *contrary* to nature and to reason. Lange does not mean to characterize the view of the fathers as unnatural, but as unnecessarily adding another miracle—the passing through a stone—to the resurrection itself. Burkitt and M. Henry assume, that while Christ could have rolled back the stone by His own power, He chose to have it done by an angel, to signify that He did not break prison, but had a fair and *legal discharge* from heaven. In the case of Lazarus the stone was removed from the grave before he was raised by Christ to a new natural life. But the stone could hardly be a hindrance to Him who raised Himself by His own power to an eternal heavenly life and who afterward appeared to the disciples through closed doors (John xx. 19, 26). The stone may have been rolled away merely for the sake of the women and the disciples, that they might go into the empty tomb and see the evidence of the resurrection. This at all events is the more usual orthodox interpretation.—P. S.]

† [Similarly Wordsworth: "ὑμεῖς] emphatic: Let the *Roman soldiers* fear (ver. 4)—not *ye,*—weak *women* though ye be." Meyer (in the fifth edition) maintains against de Wette and others that the personal pronoun is *always* emphatic in the N. T., even Mark xiii. 9; Acts viii. 24.—P. S.]

This account reminds us of the state of mind evidenced by Thomas, John xx.

Ver. 10. **Be not afraid; go tell.**—*Asyndeton* of lively conversation. A sign that the Lord shares in their joy.—**My brethren.**—A new designation of the disciples, which declares to them His consoling sympathy; makes known to them that He, as the Risen One, had not been alienated from them by their flight and treachery, but that rather they are summoned by Him to become partners in His resurrection. The command was, in the first instance, issued to raise the women from the ground, whom His divine majesty had prostrated.—Tell my brethren **that they go.**—This proclamation of the resurrection by the women is to lead the disciples, whom the fact of the Lord's being buried in Jerusalem detained in that city, to make their preparations for an instant departure to their homes.

And there they shall see Me.—As before, in ver. 7, the disciples as a body are meant, who, according to Matthew, had followed Him from Galilee. And therefore, when the eleven disciples are (ver. 16) specially mentioned, it can only be as the leaders, as the guides of the entire company. Meyer represents that a threefold tradition regarding the resurrection grew up among the disciples: 1. The purely *Galilæan*, which is found in Matthew's account; 2. the purely *Judæan*, which is given by Luke and John, excluding the appendix, ch. xxi.; 3. the *mixed*, which narrated both the Galilean and Judæan manifestations, and is found in John, when the appendix is added. Meyer is now willing to admit the historical sequence, that the appearances in Judæa preceded those in Gallilee; but he holds still, that the account given by Matthew manifests an ignorance of what occurred in Galilee.* From this he deduces the conclusion, that this portion of our Gospel must be the addition of a non-apostolic hand, because such ignorance on the part of Matthew is inconceivable. But against this critic's assumption we may educe the following:— 1. If this assumption be correct, we should expect even from Mark in his Gospel,† which was written earlier, and fixed the middle point of the evangelical tradition, only Galilæan appearances, whereas he relates only manifestations in Judæa. 2. Matthew himself relates the Lord's appearance in Judæa to the women, vers. 9, 10. 3. A post-apostolic writer would most certainly have resorted to the general tradition, and have related both the appearances which took place in Judæa and those which occurred in Galilee. 4. The assumption of Meyer rests altogether *upon the antiquated hypothesis*, that every Evangelist intended to narrate all the facts he knew. On the contrary, we must repeat that the Evangelists are not to be regarded as poor mechanical chroniclers, but as narrators of the facts of evangelical history, as they assumed in their own minds the form of an organic whole, as one continuous gospel sermon. And here we have an indication that Matthew keeps up throughout the plan of his gospel narrative as distinct from that of Luke. While Luke, the Evangelist of the Gentiles, brings out fully the *true* prerogatives of Judaism, and describes, therefore, the whole of Christ's life of activity as a grand procession to Jerusalem, Matthew, the Evangelist of the Jews, endeavors in every instance to disprove the *false* prerogatives of Judaism, and tarries accordingly mostly in Galilee, describing the Lord's activity in that district. Hence it is that Luke gives, in the introduction to his Gospel, the adoration rendered to the new-born Saviour by *Jewish* Christians, and closes his history with an account of the Lord's appearance in Judæa; while Matthew contrasts, in his opening chapters, the adoration on the part of the *Gentiles* with the persecution of the Jews, and concludes by laying the scene of the grandest manifestation of the Lord in Galilee, in opposition to the city Jerusalem. From this to conclude that Matthew knew nothing *more* of the resurrection, is a conceit which falls far below* a lively appreciation of the free Christian spirit of the Gospels. Meyer himself acknowledges that it is evident, from 1 Cor. xv. 5 ff., that even if all the accounts in the Gospels be combined, we have not a full record of all Christ's appearances after His resurrection. Meyer, however, is right in opposing the mythical view which Strauss takes of the history of the resurrection, as well as the conversion of the facts connected with resurrection, by Weisse, into magical effects of the departed spirit of Jesus. The actual existence of the Church, as well as the assurance of faith and joy at death's approach evidenced by the Apostles, cannot be the effect of a myth or a mere ghostly apparition. (*See* below.)

[The denial of the historical character of the resurrection and the subsequent manifestations of Christ to the disciples, has assumed different forms: 1. The Wolfenbüttel Fragmentist (Reimarus), like the lying Jewish Sanhedrin (ch. xxviii. 13), resolved them into downright impostures of the Apostles: this is a *moral* impossibility and monstrosity unworthy of consideration. 2. Paulus, of Heidelberg, the exegetical representative of the older common-sense rationalism, sees in the resurrection merely a reviving from an apparent death or trance. This is a *physical* impossibility in view of the preceding crucifixion and loss of blood. 3. Strauss: Subjective visions, or more fully in his own words (*see* his new work on the *Life of Jesus*, published 1864, p. 304): "Purely internal occurrences, which may have presented themselves to the disciples as external visible phenomena, but which we can only understand as facts of an ecstatic condition of mind, or visions." Similarly the late Dr. Baur of Tübingen (the teacher of Strauss, and founder of the Tübingen school of destructive criticism). This visionary hypothesis is a *psychological* impossibility, in view of the many appearances, and the large number of persons who saw Christ; as the eleven dis-

* [So also in the fifth edition, p. 613, although he expressly admits the historical character of the appearances of Christ both in Judæa and in Galilee. "*Dass Jesus* SOWOHL *in Jerusalem* ALS AUCH *in Galiläa den Jüngern erschienen sei, ist schon aus dem Bestehen der Judäischen und der Galiläischen Ueberlieferung neben einander als geschichtliches Ergebniss zu schliessen, wird aber* ZWEIFELLOS *durch Johannes, wenn, wie anzunehmen, Kap.* 21 *das Werk des Apostels ist. So kommt man allerdings zu dem* GESCHICHTSBESTANDE, *dass die Judäischen Erscheinungen den Galiläischen vorangegangen sind; aber dabei ist nicht zu übersehen, dass der Bericht des Matthäus nichts von den Judäischen Erscheinungen weiss, weil im Zusammenhang seiner Erzählung nirgends ein Platz für sie ist.*" Meyer regards this supposed ignorance of the first Gospel as one of the arguments for his hypothesis that in its *present Greek* form it is not the work of the Apostle Matthew. This conclusion is too rash. It is sufficient in the case to say, with the late Dr. Bleek, one of the most careful and conscientious critics, that Matthew's account is a brief condensation. But *see* Dr. Lange's forcible remarks above, which Meyer ought to have noticed in the fifth edition.—P. S.]

† [The Edinb. edition omits the name of *Mark*, and refers this sentence to the *early written Gospel of Matthew*, to which it does not apply at all, since Matthew relates the manifestation of the risen Saviour in Galilee.—P. S.]

* [Not: *unworthy of one who*, etc., as the Edinb. ed. mistranslates Lange, who opposes opinions only, and never indulges in personalities which would mar the dignity of a commentary.—P. S.]

ciples, and even five hundred brethren at once (1 Cor. xv. 6). 4. Weisse: Effects of the ever-living spirit of Christ upon the disciples. 5. Ewald: Spiritual visions in the ecstasies of desire and prayer (*geistige Schauungen in der Entzückung der Sehnsucht und des Gebets*). These two views are only modifications of the above theory of Strauss, and equally untenable. Ewald, however, is not clear, and makes an approach to the orthodox view when he remarks: "Christ was seen again by His disciples: *nothing is more historical.*" (*Die drei ersten Evangelien, übersetzt und erklärt;* p. 362: "*Christus ward wiedergesehen von den Seinigen: nichts ist geschichtlicher als dies.*") Renan, in his *Life of Jesus*, passes over this stumbling-block with characteristic French levity, promising to examine "the legends of the resurrection" hereafter in the history of the Apostles. All he says upon it at the close of ch. xxvi. amounts to a confession of despair at a satisfactory solution. It is this: "The life of Jesus, to the historian, ends with his last sigh. But so deep was the trace which he had left in the hearts of his disciples and of a few devoted women, that, for weeks to come, he was to them living and consoling. Had his body been taken away, or did enthusiasm, always credulous, afterward generate the mass of accounts by which faith in the resurrection was sought to be established? *This, for want of peremptory evidence, we shall never know.* We may say, however, that the strong imagination of Mary Magdalene here enacted the principal part!" All these false views resolve the history of Christianity into an inexplicable riddle, and make it a stream without a fountain, an effect without a cause. Dr. Baur (*Christenthum der drei ersten Jahrhunderte*, p. 40), indeed, thinks that the *faith* in the resurrection more than the *fact* of the resurrection was the motive power of the Apostles in their future activity. (So also Strauss, *l. c.* p. 289.) But it was the *fact* which gave to their faith a power that conquered the world and the devil. Faith in mere visions or phantoms may produce phantoms, but not such a phenomenon as the Christian Church, the greatest fact and the mightiest institution in the history of the world. Compare also on this subject the remarks of MEYER, *Com. on Matthew*, 5th ed., 1860, p. 614 (who is quite orthodox as regards the *general fact* of the resurrection); GUDER: *Die Thatsächlichkeit der Auferstehung Christi*, 1862; an art. of Prof. BEYSCHLAG (against Baur) in the *Studien und Kritiken*, 1864, p. 197 sqq., and several able articles of Prof. FISHER, of Yale College, against Strauss and Baur, in the *New Englander* for 1864.—P. S.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *In the end of the* (Jewish) *Sabbath.*—The Evangelist, without doubt, intended by the selection of this peculiar and significant expression to bring forward the fact, that the Christian Sunday had now caused the Jewish Sabbath to cease (and Christianity had now taken the place of Judaism). Sunday is the fulfilment of the Sabbath; but it is not thereby made to be the negation, the destruction of the Sabbath, but its realization in the form of spirit, life, and freedom. Sunday is a new creation, the institution of the Church's holy day; marked out as such not only by the resurrection, but also by the Lord's appearances upon that day. But if the external law of the Jewish Sabbath is abrogated for the Church, the Christian State is bound, by its duty to Christ, to see that the law of the day of holy rest is observed, as indeed all the laws of the decalogue, in the spirit of New Testament order and freedom. We see from Acts xx. 7: 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2; Rev. i. 10, that Sunday was observed in the days of the Apostles.

2. *Who shall roll us away the stone from the door of the sepulchre?*—This utterance of the three anxious women has become the great symbol of all the sighs of humanity, in its longing for the revelation of the resurrection.

3. *The earthquake.*—A presage of the resurrection according to that parallel course of development through which the earth is passing along with the kingdom of God. *See* ch. xxiv.

4. *The visions of angels.*—As the earth, on the one hand, in its grand moment of development, is shaken, and seems rushing to ruin; so, on the other, the heavens unfold. Therefore angels are ever present as ministering spirits at the critical periods in God's kingdom. But although these angelic appearances are *objective*, real, and visible, the perception by the on-looking mortals of these heavenly spirits depends upon a state of soul resembling the angelic spirituality; and this disposition of soul depends, again, upon the position occupied in relation to heaven and earth. The more the earth is concealed and buried, like a midnight grave, to the beholders, so much the more clearly do they view the opening heavens. And hence it is that the female disciples were the first to see the angels; and they beheld first one, then two.

5. *Fear and great joy.*—Transition from the old into the new world, from the old to the new covenant.

6. *Into Galilee.*—*See* the *Critical Notes.*

7. *The death and resurrection of Christ considered in and for itself* (*ontologically*).—In the Lord's death and resurrection a separation took place between the first æon of the natural human world, and the second æon of the eternal spirit-world of humanity (1 Cor. xv. 45). Christ's death is the fulfilment and the completion of death, and therefore also its end, as was already determined in regard to Adam's death. Where death began, there should it cease, *i. e.*, there should be no death. Physical death is restricted to one zone. This district of death lies between the world of inorganic bodies on the one side, and the spirit-world on the other. The mineral, on the one side, is non-vital; the spirit is non-mortal. Death appears now to extend, between these limits, only over the vegetable, animal, and human worlds. But the death of the plant is well-nigh but *allegorical*, an *appearance* of dying: it lives still in the root, the branch, the seed. The dying of the animal, again, is no *complete* death: there is no full, individual life to resign; it lives only in the general life of nature, and hence it cannot die fully and with consciousness. Actual death begins with conscious man, in order likewise to cease with him, and to be transformed into a new conscious life. Adam was formed, not to die, that is, was not to see corruption; he was to pass only through a death-like process of transformation, and to undergo a metamorphosis from the *natural* state of man into the *spiritual* (the tree of life; Enoch; Elijah; 2 Cor. v. 4; 1 Cor. xv. 51). But this transformation became subject to the effects and the punishment of *moral* death, of sin, as God's condemnation; and *thus this transformation passed over into corruption.* The "being clothed upon" (symbolized by the metamorphosis of the butterfly-chrysalis) became "the unclothing" (symbolized by the wheat-

grain in the earth). Since then was death in the world; the consciousness and the experience of deserved sickness, dissolution, corruption, and imprisonment in the waste death-realm, Sheol. The entire weight of death pressed upon mankind, to their pain and anguish; and yet they were not fully conscious of it (Heb. ii. 14, 15). Christ became our partner in this common subjection to death. He tasted this death (Heb. ii. 9); received it with full consciousness into His life. Hence death was *fulfilled* in His life, it was ended, and must again be transformed into the transformation, unto which men were originally destined. Christ's dying was a death which passed over at once into metamorphosis. Christ's condition in death was a collision with corruption, in which corruption was overcome; was an entrance into the realm of the dead, which unbound the fetters of that realm. His resurrection was at once resurrection and complete transformation. When the question is asked, Was Christ glorified between His death and resurrection, or during the forty days, or during the ascension? the conceptions of transformation and glorification are confused. The transformation, as the passage from the first into the second life, was decided at the resurrection. Glorification, as His entrance into the heavenly world, could appear in Him even before His death, in the transfiguration upon the mountain, and be viewed by others; and yet after the resurrection, in His first presentation to Mary Magdalene, she mistook Him for the gardener. His actual glorification, decided at His resurrection, became a complete fact upon His ascension; and hence Christ, as the Risen One, is life-principle as well for the resurrection as for the transformation (1 Cor. xv. 21; 1 Thess. iv. 17).

If we would obtain a closer view and more accurate conception of the resurrection, the death of Christ must be contemplated as the ideal, dynamic, and essential end of the old world and humanity. The world continues to move chronologically according to its old existence, and is still expanding in its members (its periphery); but in its centre, the end has been reached in the death and resurrection of Christ. And this being the case, there is of necessity connected with this end the ideal, dynamic, and essential beginning of the new spiritual world, as the resurrection followed the death of Christ. And this event is, in accordance with its nature, at once an *evolution of life* (Christ *rose*), and at the same time an act of God's righteousness (the Father *raised Him*). Christ rose from the grave, because He was holy, possessing the Spirit of glory, susceptible of resurrection, and must accordingly cause this very death to become subservient unto life, must overcome this death and transform it. God raised Him, because He, in and for Himself, had endured this death contrary to right; and yet, likewise, agreeably to right, inasmuch as He had surrendered Himself on behalf of man. Thereby this death of Christ has been made by God the world's atonement. But when these two points are united, the death of Christ and His resurrection stand forth to our view as the grandest act of the omnipotence of God, and the greatest fact in the glorious revelation of the Trinity (Eph. i. 19).

8. *The death and resurrection of Christ considered soteriologically.*—The soteriological effect is here, as always, threefold; He accomplished: (*a*) reconciliation as Prophet; (*b*) expiation as High-Priest; (*c*) deliverance, redemption, as King (*see* the author's *Dogmatik*, p. 793). Christ, as Prophet, in His reconciliatory working, has overcome the world's hate by His love, and sealed the grace of God by the blood of His martyr-death; as High-Priest, in His expiatory working, He has taken upon Him the world's judgment, and changed it into deliverance; as King, in His redemptive working, He has made death itself the emblem of victory over death, or of deliverance from the power of darkness, which sinners were subject unto through death.

In this threefold character and working, He entered Sheol. As Prophet, He has lighted up Sheol, and made it appear as the translation-state from the first to the second and higher life. As High-Priest, He has likewise changed the punishment of the realm of death by taking the penalty of sins freely upon Himself. As King, He has led captivity captive, and opened the prison-house of Sheol (Eph. iv. 8).

God has made all this sure by setting His seal to it in His resurrection. God Himself recognizes that courageous love and greeting of peace by which He carries His gospel back into that world which had crucified Him. God Himself sends Him back out of the Most Holy as a living sign of, and witness to, the perfect atonement. As the Redeemer, He comes forth in the glory of that triumph, which He shares with own: "O Death, where is thy sting! O Grave, where is thy victory!"

The unity of these results lies in this, that in Christ mankind have been virtually consecrated to their God, have died, been buried, descended into Sheol, risen again, ascended to heaven, and set down at the right hand of God.

Hence it is that the man who resists with demoniac unbelief this working of Christ, is cut off from humanity, and is handed over to the devil and his angels (Matt. xxv.).

But to receive the redeeming efficacy of Christ, is to enter into the communion of His life by the communion of His Spirit. This entrance is a prophetic faith, in that we recognize what Christ has become to us; a priestly faith, in that we yield us up to His atoning righteousness; a kingly faith, in that we make, in sanctification, His life our own. The unity of all this lies in the fact, that we die, are buried, rise, and ascend in Christ. As regards his spirit, the Christian belongs to Christ, and in so far all is finished and completed in his salvation; but as regards his nature, he belongs to the world, and in so far he awaits the general end of that world, and a general resurrection with that world.

9. "The intercourse and companionship of the Lord, after His resurrection, with His disciples, during the forty days of joy, bore manifestly a different character from what they did before His death. Through His death and resurrection, the glorification of His body had begun (the transformation of His body was completed);—for, although His resurrection-body bore the marks of the wounds, showing it to be the same body, it was no more subject to the bounds and laws of the bodily existence, as before." Lisco. For the historic certainty of the resurrection of Jesus, *see* 1 Cor. xv.; Ullmann: *What does the institution of the Christian Church through one who had been crucified presuppose?* (*Studien und Kritiken*, 1832); Lange's *Leben Jesu*, ii. 3, p. 1738. According to one explanation of the negative criticism of modern unbelief, Jesus was only *apparently dead* (Paulus); according to the other, the resurrection was an *illusion* (Strauss). When the two are combined, they are self-destructive.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Upon the entire Chapter.—The risen Saviour as the eternal King, the fundamental thought of this whole Easter history. We see from it: 1. How the storms of earth and the angels of heaven serve Him; 2. how neither Jewish seals nor Roman arms are any hindrance in His way; 3. how He annihilates the spite * of His foes, and the anguish of His friends, by His resurrection; 4. how He moves along, elevated above the slanderous reports of foes, and the desponding apprehension of the disciples; 5. how unbounded is His power in heaven and earth; 6. how He is able to despatch, in the glory of the Trinity, His servants into all the world, with the message of salvation; 7. how sure, even at the beginning, He is of the homage of all the world; 8. how He is able, notwithstanding His approaching departure, to assure His own of His protecting, ever-abiding presence, as their consolation and their peace.

Upon this particular Section.—The morning of the resurrection-day. 1. The morning-dawn; or, the victory of light over darkness: the earthquake and the angels; the petrified guards and the open grave; the search for the Crucified—the message concerning the risen Lord; the fear and the great joy. 2. The sunrise: Christ's manifestation; the greeting; the adoration; the commission.—The judgment of God, as revealed by the grave of Christ, compared with the world's judgment: 1. The Sabbath of the law is passed; the Sunday of spiritual freedom breaks. 2. The earth shudders; heaven, with its angels, is manifested. 3. The stone, with the seal of authority broken, is rolled away; the herald of the risen Saviour sits triumphant upon the stone. 4. The armed guards lie powerless; women become heroines, and the messengers of the risen Redeemer. 5. Judæa is deposed of its dignity; Christ selects Galilee as the scene where He will unfold His glory. 6. The compact of darkness is destroyed; Christ, the Risen, salutes His own.—The gradual unfolding, to be perceived in the message of the resurrection, is a type of its glory.—The ghost-like stillness in which Christ's resurrection is revealed, is prophetic and characteristic of the Christian life, and the Christian world.—The greatest miracle of omnipotence, in its gentle, heavenly manifestation.—The resurrection-morning the end of the old Sabbath: 1. The creation becomes spiritual, a spiritual world; 2. the rest becomes a festival; 3. the law becomes life.—Easter, the great Sunday, ever returning in the Christian Sabbath, the eternal Easter.—The way to the grave of Jesus: 1. The road thither: the visible grief (to anoint the Lord); the secret hope (*to see* the grave); the great experience—the stone, the angel, etc. 2. The return: fear and great joy; the salutation of Jesus; the commission.—The Mary of Christmas, and the two Marys of Easter; or, woman's share in the great works of God.—First to Mary Magdalene; or, Christ risen for the pardoned sinner.—The grave of Christ transforms our graves.—The fact of the resurrection, an invisible mystery, rendered glorious by visible signs: 1. The invisible working of omnipotence, and its visible action; 2. the invisible entrance into existence of the new life of Christ, and the visible earthquake (the birth-pangs of earth); 3. the invisible entrance of the heavenly King into His spiritual kingdom, and the unseen spirit-messenger; 4. the invisible overthrow of the kingdom of darkness, and the visible guards (the servants of that kingdom) as dead men; 5. the invisible, new, victorious kingdom of Jesus, and the beginning of its revelation.—The angel from heaven; or, from heaven the decision comes: 1. Help in need; 2. the unsolving of the difficulty; 3. the turning-point of history; 4. the change of the old; 5. the glorious issue of a remarkable guidance.—The angel sitting upon the stone, a representation of Christ's victory: 1. In its full extent,—over the Gentile world and the Jewish world (soldiers and the official seal);—over the kingdom of darkness. 2. In its fullest completion,—seated in the shining garments of triumph.—The angel's raiment, the Sunday ornament and attire in which the Easter festival is celebrated.—The twofold effect of Christ's resurrection: 1. The old heroes tremble and are impotent, the desponding become heroic; 2. the living become as dead, and those who had been as dead become alive.—*Fear not ye!* And why not? 1. Because they seek Jesus; 2. because He is not in the grave, but is risen; 3. because the view of Himself awaits you.—Jesus the crucified, is the risen Saviour's title of honor in heaven and on earth.—*He is risen, as He said;* or, Love is stronger than death; or, This great fulfilment is a pledge for all Christ's promises.—And ye, too, shall rise, as He has said.—*Come, see the place.* The disciples' view of the empty grave of Jesus: 1. The beginning of the certainty of the resurrection; 2. the beginning of the Christian's blessedness; 3. the beginning of the world's end.—The empty grave, and the empty graves.—*Go quickly;* or, whosoever has discovered the resurrection of Christ, must go and make it known.—All Christians are evangelists.—The union of fear and great joy: 1. That fear, which must burst into joy; 2. that joy, which must be rooted in fear.—*They ran.* The resurrection ends the old race, and begins a new race.—The appearance of the risen Lord: 1. What it presupposes: *And as they went.* 2. How it proceeds:* a meeting, a greeting: All hail! 3. What it effects: *And they came*, etc. (ver. 9). 4. What it enjoins: *Go, tell*, etc. (ver. 10).—The relation of the Risen One to His people: 1. The old: they search and find one another, in faith and love. 2. A new: they worship Him; He calls them His *brethren*.—Joseph's history is in this case fulfilled: he was sold by the sons of Israel, and yet revealed himself in his princely majesty to *his brethren*.—The repeated command to depart to Galilee,—its import (*see* above).—The resurrection of Jesus is the most certain fact of history: 1. It proves itself; 2. hence it is proven by the strongest proofs; 3. hence the proof is for our faith (our love and hope).—The resurrection, the fulfilling of the life of Jesus: 1. The wonder of wonders; 2. the salvation of salvation; 3. the life of life; 4. the heaven of the kingdom of heaven.

Starke:—From *Zeisius:* An earthquake occurs when Christ dies upon the cross, an earthquake occurs when He rises again, to testify unto the majestic power both of His victorious death and resurrection.—Christ's glorified body, the great stone could not restrain.—Oh, cunning Reason! how silly art thou in spiritual and divine things!—*Canstein:* If we find no help on earth to overcome hindrances in the path of duty, help will be sent us from heaven.—We shall live with Him. Where the Head is, there are the

* [Not: *consolation*, as the Edinb. edition reads, evidently mistaking the German *Trotz* for *Trost*.—P. S.]

* [In German: *Wie sie vor sich geht*, which the Edinb. edition renders: *How it anticipates itself!*—P. S.]

members.—2 Thess. i. 10; 1 Thess. iv. 13.—*Nova Bibl. Tub.*: Behold, how glorious, etc. So glorious shall be our resurrection.—As glorious and consoling as Christ's resurrection is to the godly, so fearful is it to the godless.—*Quesnel*: God knows how at once to console His own, and to terrify the wicked, Ex. xiv. 24.—*Luther's margin*: *Fear not ye, fear not ye*: be joyful and consoled.—*Zeisius*: Fearful as the holy angels are unto the unholy, just so comforting are they unto the godly, as companions, in the approaching glory.—*Canstein*: The servants of the word should exercise the office of comforting angels, or God's messengers of consolation, unto the anguished. —*Bibl. Wirt.*: As the woman was the first to sin, so have women been the first to realize Christ's purchased righteousness.—*Nova Bibl. Tub.*: The joyful message of the resurrection, and its fruits, are not for coarse, worldly hearts, but for longing disciples. —Those who have really experienced the joy produced by the resurrection, are anxious to impart that joy to others.—Jesus comes to meet us when we seek Him.—*My brethren*. A designation dating from the resurrection, Heb. ii. 12. For the disciples, it indicates something great and most consolatory.—Joseph a type of this, Gen. xlv. 4.—The world boasts always of its high titles; but we, who are Christ's, have the highest, we are called His *brethren*.—We are heartily to forgive those who have not deserved well of us.

Gossner:—It gleams and flashes once more. Before, all was dark and sad; but now again the rays of crucified truth appear, and they illuminate ever more and more gloriously.

Lisco:—The women *hear* first that Jesus is risen. Then they *see* the empty grave, ver. 6. Finally, they see, feel, and speak to Jesus, ver. 9.—The certainty of Christ's resurrection, 1 Cor. xv. 1–8. Its importance, 1 Cor. xv. 12: 1. Proof that Jesus is the Christ; 2. that His death is an offering for us; 3. the ground for our hope of a resurrection. By His death, all the preceding testimonies borne unto Him seem to be proved false; by His resurrection, it is proved that nothing has been disproved. His resurrection is the seal of our redemption, the beginning of His glorification and exaltation.—The Easter festival is a call to a spiritual resurrection.

Gerlach:—The Lord's body now a different body, and yet the same: 1. Free from all the bonds of weakness, of suffering, of mortality. 2. The stigmata;* He ate and drank (though He needed not food). —The Lord's appearances, and all the accompanying circumstances, are in the highest degree full of meaning and importance. The women see the angels; the disciples do not. Jesus appears to the Magdalene, to Peter, to disciples on their way to Emmaus, to the Eleven; in each case, with the most tender and exact regard for the state of each.—All the external a revelation of the internal. So shall it one day be in our resurrection.

Heubner:—The awe of the resurrection-morning. —Christ's resurrection the type of our own.—Every morning should remind us of the coming resurrection —*Came Mary*: The last witnesses by the grave are the first. We should seek God early.—[*Rieger*:]— They considered themselves bound to anoint Christ; but Christ must and will anoint them with the Holy Spirit and with power.—The earthquake a type of the awful convulsion of the earth at the last day and the general resurrection.—The angel a type of the appearance of the angels at the last day.—The form of the angel's appearance. Servants as they are of the kingdom of light, their office is to introduce men into this kingdom.—The experiences of the guards, presages of what the unbelieving and sinners will experience at the last day.—*Fear not ye!* The higher spirit-world is the Christian's home.—To seek Jesus is the way to life.—Nothing to be feared on that way.—The Lord is risen. The angel-world cries to the world of men, and all believers should cry to one another: "The Lord is risen."—"Death, where is thy sting? Hell, where thy victory?" (1 Cor. xv.).—*Come and see*: a summons to self-persuasion. —We should impart, spread abroad, the belief in the resurrection.—Our belief in the future life should thoroughly permeate our earthly life, and glorify it. —Christ's resurrection reunites the scattered disciples.—Love plans for eternity.—In the case of the women, faith went first, then came sight.—The perfect brotherhood of Christ, a fruit of God's adoption. —Three classes of topics for Easter: 1. Such in which the fact itself is considered; truth, certainty, power of the resurrection. 2. Such in which Christ's resurrection is made to introduce a discourse upon our own; *e. g.*, the resurrection, the festival of our immortality. 3. Such in which faith on Christ in general is handled; *e. g.*, faith upon a living Christ. —*Braune*: The essence* of Christianity is bound up with the cross, but its form and manifestation with the resurrection.—The Church has been founded by the preaching of the resurrection of Christ.—The Apostles designate themselves, with peculiar pleasure, the witnesses of the resurrection.—As the beginning of every life is hidden, so is the beginning of the life of the risen Lord hidden in mysterious darkness, Acts ii. 21.—Jesus has not simply *taught* the resurrection; He *is* the resurrection.—What caused the guards dismay, freed the women of anxiety.—With every advancing step, the path of eternal truth brightens.—The fear of the women quite different from that of the guards.—*To My brethren*: first He named them *disciples*, then *friends*, then *little children*; now, *brethren*.

From Sermons.

Reinhard:—The Christian feast of Easter is a festival of perfect tranquillization: 1. Because it dissipates all the uneasiness and sorrow which disturb our peace; 2. because it wakens in us all those hopes which must confirm our peace.—Christ's resurrection was the impartation of life unto God's holy Church on earth, which owes to His resurrection: 1. Its existence; 2. its moral life; 3. its unceasing continuance.—*Thiess*:—The cross illuminated by the Easter sun.—*Ranke*:—A clear light is poured over the whole life of Christ by His resurrection.—*Gaupp*:— The Easter history is also the history of the believing

* [In German: *die Wundenmaale*, the technical term for the marks or traces of the five wounds of the Saviour, the prints of the nails in the hands, etc., which Thomas wished to handle, before submitting to the belief in the fact of the resurrection (John xx. 25, 27). They are here referred to as a proof of the identity of the body of our Lord. The Edinb. edition makes here another ridiculous and incredible blunder by translating this familiar German expression (composed of *Wunden*, *i. e.*, *wounds*, and *Maale*, *i. e.*, *moles*): *meals of wonder*, as if the text spoke of *Wundermahlzeiten*!—P. S.]

* [*Das Wesen*, which the Edinb. edition mistranslates: *the existence* (*das Sein*, *Dasein*, *die Existenz*). The existence of Christianity and the founding of the Church depends rather on the resurrection, as is expressly stated in the sentence immediately following.—P. S.]

soul.—*Ahlfeld:* — Jesus lives, and I with Him.—*Otho:* Easter comfort and Easter pleasure: 1. The sanctity of our graves; 2. the glory of the resurrection; 3. all our sins forgotten.—*Petri:* Christ's life, our life. Let that be to-day: 1. Our Easter belief; 2. our Easter rejoicing.—*Steinhofer:* Life from the dead: 1. In the Saviour; 2. in His people.—*Rautenberg:* The Christian by his Redeemer's open grave: 1. He lays his care in that grave; 2. he becomes at that spot sure of his salvation; 3. his heart is filled with rapture.—*Brandt:* Jesus Christ the victorious prince. We may consider: 1. The foes He has subdued; 2. the obstacles He has overcome; 3. the means used to secure this victory; 4. its results.—Jesus, the risen Saviour, an object for holy contemplation: 1. See the counsel of hell brought to nought by Him; 2. see the method of the divine government glorified by Him; 3. the tears of true love dried; 4. the misery of this earthly life transformed; 5. the work of salvation finished; 6. the human heart filled with the powers of God.—*Geibel:* The Lord's resurrection, considered: 1. Historically; 2. in its necessity; 3. import; 4. and immediate results.—*Fickenscher:* What should the grave be to us Christians, now that Jesus is risen? 1. A place of rest; 2. of peace; 3. of hope; 4. of transfiguration.—*Rambach:* The glorious victory of the risen Saviour: 1. Glorious considered in itself:—(*a*) the most miraculous; (*b*) the most honoring; (*c*) the most glorious victory. 2. Glorious in its effects:—(*a*) a victory of light over darkness; (*b*) of grace over sin; (*c*) of life over death.—*Dräseke:* How Easter followed Good Friday: 1. As God's Amen; 2. as men's Hallelujah.—*Sachse:* —The stone rolled away. It seems to us: 1. The boundary-stone of blasphemy against God; 2. as the monumental stone of the most glorious victory; 3. as the foundation-stone of the building of Christ's Church.—*Fr. Strauss:* A long, sacred history is to-day presented to us, the history of the Easter festival: 1. The long-continued preparation; 2. the glorious manifestation: 3. the continual development; 4. the future consummation in heaven.—*Alt:* The new life to which Easter summons.—*Liebner:* How we should enter the companionship, and follow the example, of the early witnesses unto the resurrection. —*Shultz:* The verities of our faith, unto which the resurrection of our Lord bears a certain and irresistible tendency: 1. That Jesus is the Son of the living God; 2. that a perfect atonement has been presented to God for us, in the Lord's death; 3. that our soul is immortal; 4. that our bodies also will rise.—All the difficulties in Christ's life are resolved by His resurrection. — *Heidenreich:* What a friendly dawn broke upon redeemed and blessed humanity on the morning of the resurrection!—*Schleiermacher:* How the consciousness of the imperishable overcomes the pain caused by the loss of the perishable.—The life of the resurrection of our Lord a glorious type of our new life.—*Canstein:* The joy of the Easter morning in the future world: 1. What shall it be? 2. who shall enjoy it?—*F. A. Wolf:* The true Christian, upon the festival of the resurrection, looks back as gratefully unto the past, as he gazes joyfully into the future.—Three stages in the spiritual life are to be observed in the history of those to whom the risen Redeemer became the closest friend: 1. A sadness, which seeks Jesus; 2. a hope, which springs up at the first intimation of His presence; 3. the joyful certainty, to have found and recognized the Redeemer.—*Tzschirner:* The sufferings of time in the light of eternal glory.—Death, the new birth into a new life.—*Genzken:* The path of faith in the risen Saviour.—*Markeineke:* The resurrection of Jesus is the main pillar of our salvation.—*Theremin:* Christ's resurrection should awaken us to repentance.—*Niemann:* The belief in the new world of immortality which opened unto us in the Lord's resurrection.

SECOND SECTION.

JUDAISM, AND ITS TALE; OR, THE IMPOTENT END OF THE OLD WORLD.

CHAPTER XXVIII. 11–15.

11 Now when [as] they [the women] were going, behold, some of the watch came into
12 the city, and shewed unto [told][1] the chief priests all the things that were done. And
when they [the high-priests] were assembled with the elders, and had taken counsel,[2]
13 they gave large [much][3] money unto the soldiers, Saying, Say ye, His disciples came
14 by night, and stole him *away* while we slept. And if this come to the governor's ears,[4]
we will persuade him, and secure you [make you secure, free of care or danger, ὑμᾶς
15 ἀμερίμνους ποιήσομεν].[5] So they took the money, and did as they were taught: and
this saying is commonly reported among the Jews until this day [*i. e.*, the time of the composition of this Gospel].[6]

[1] Ver. 11.—[Comp. Critical Note No. 6 on ch. xxviii. 8. Others prefer *reported to.*—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 12.—[Or more literally: *having assembled . . . and taken counsel*, συναχθέντες καὶ λαβόντες. So Conant and the N. T. of the Am. Bible Union.—P. S.]

[3] Ver. 12.—[Wiclif, Scrivener, Conant. etc., render ἀργύρια ἱκανά, *much money*, instead of *large money*, which dates from Tyndale, Coverdale, Cranmer, etc. The Rhemish N. T. has: *a large sum of money*. De Wette, Lange, and Ewald: *reichlich Geld;* Luther: *Geld's genug;* van Ess and other German Versions: *viel Geld.*—P. S.]

[4] Ver. 14.—[Or: *be borne witness of before the governor;* an official or judicial hearing is intended; comp. for a similar use of ἐπί Acts xxiv. 19, 20; xxv. 9, 12, 26; xxvi. 2; 1 Cor. vi. 1; 1 Tim. v. 19; vi. 13. But compare the remarks of Dr. Lange in the *Exeg. Notes.* Lachmann and Tregelles read: ἐὰν ἀκουσθῇ τοῦτο ὑπὸ (instead of ἐπὶ) τοῦ ἡγεμόνος, *if this shall be heard by the governor,* following the Vatican Codex (B.), Codex Bezæ (D.), and the oldest Versions (*Itala* and *Vulgata: si hoc auditum fuerit a præside*). But Meyer and Lange regard this as a mistaken explanation of ἐπί, which is sustained by the majority of authorities. Conant, in his Version, adopts the reading ὑπό, but the N. T. of the Am. Bible Union, which otherwise follows his Version closely, has here: "*before* the governor." Scrivener takes no notice of this verse.—P. S.]

[5] Ver. 14.—[Lange: *sorgenfrei, free of care;* Meyer: *sorgenfrei* im objectiven Sinne, *i. e., frei von Gefahr und Plackereien;* Tyndale 1.: *make you safe;* Coverdale: *ye shall be safe;* Tyndale 2., Cranmer, Genevan Bible, Scrivener: *save you harmless;* Bishops' B., very improperly: *make you careless;* Conant and others: *make you secure.*—P. S.]

[6] Ver. 15.—Lachmann and Tischendorf [not in his edition of 1859] add ἡμέρας (*day*) after τῆς σήμερον, which is supported by Codd. B., D., L., al. [Tischendorf, in the edition of 1859, says: "ἡμέρα *ubi a paucis tantum testibus præbetur, potius illatum quam verum esse statuendum est,*" but the fact that Matthew in two other passages (xi. 23; xxvii. 8) uses σήμερον without ἡμέρα makes the insertion in this case less probable than the omission. Meyer and Alford likewise defend it here.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 11. **As they were going.**—The Evangelist does not seek to show that the soldiers arrived in the city before the women, but only that, contemporaneously, a second account reached the city,—that one message was borne to the friends, and another to the enemies.

Ver. 12. **And had taken counsel.**—This is the last session of the Sanhedrin, so exacting of reverence, which is recorded by Matthew, and its last decision. It is a very significant transaction, which gives us a perfect revelation, prospectively, of the post-Christian, unbelieving Judaism. Some have considered this very disgraceful decision of the council to be improbable. But, standing as they did upon the brink of moral destruction and condemnation, this improbability becomes the most awful reality. Still, we are not compelled by our text to believe that they held the meeting for the express purpose of bribing the guards: that was merely a result of their council, and of their deliberations. Probably the matter was handed over to a commission, to be examined into and disposed of; that is, the council left the matter in the hands of the high-priests, agreeing secretly with their designs.

Much money.—Increased bribes, as compared with the former bribery, that of Judas: 1. The bribery in this case was in consequence of a resolution of the Sanhedrin. 2. The bribery by means of large sums of money, contrasts strongly with the thirty pieces which Judas received. 3. The bribery of poor Gentiles, and these Roman soldiers, who were seduced into a breach of discipline and into lies, which might have cost their lives; and with this were connected self-humiliation and self-abandonment on the part of the Sanhedrin before these very Gentiles. 4. The formal resolution, which was aimed, though indirectly, at the corruption of the soldiers, was the culmination of that guilt to which they had subjected themselves in accepting the willing and volunteered treachery of Judas. The whole account expresses distinctly the extreme and painful embarrassment of the chief council. They imagined that by means of thirty pieces of silver they had freed themselves of Judas; but now they begin first to experience the far greater danger to which the crucified and buried Saviour exposed them.

Ver. 13. **Stole Him away while we slept.**—In addition to all the judgments of impotency, embarrassment, and rejection, they are now subjected to the judgment of stupidity. The soldiers are to have been asleep, and yet to have seen thieves, and known that they were disciples! Grotius: τὸ αὐτοκατάκριτον. [This Satanic lie carries its condemnation on the face. If the soldiers were asleep, they could not discover the thieves, nor would they have proclaimed their military crime; if they, or even a few of them, were awake, they ought to have prevented the theft; it is very improbable that all the soldiers should have been asleep at once; it is equally improbable that a few timid disciples should attempt to steal their Master's body from a grave closed by a stone, officially sealed and guarded by soldiers, nor could they do it without awakening the guard, if asleep. But all these improbabilities are by no means an argument against the truthfulness of the narrative: for, if men obstinately refuse to believe the truth, "God sends them strong delusion that they should believe a lie," 2 Thess. ii. 11. With this agrees the old heathen adage: "Whom the gods wish to destroy they first make mad,"—which is constantly exemplified in history. Infatuation is a divine judgment, and the consequence of desertion by God. Among the Jews this lie finds credence to this day, as it did at the time of the composition of the Gospel of Matthew, and in the second and third centuries, according to the testimonies of Justin Martyr and Tertullian.—P. S.]

Ver. 14. **And if this come to the governor's ears.**—*Coram procuratore.* Meyer, following Erasmus, interprets this in a judicial sense: When an examination shall be held before Pilate.* But in that case, the mediation would come too late, because Pilate, according to military discipline, *must* have inflicted the penalty, if such a criminal violation of duty had been openly acknowledged. Accordingly, most commentators interpret, When this rumor shall reach the governor, be repeated unto him. Then the danger became imminent; but, according to this assurance, it would have been already removed.—This was undoubtedly an excuse highly dangerous for the soldiers (*see* Acts xii. 19), and the high-priests could by no means be sure of the result, although they might be ready to give to the avaricious and corrupt Pilate a large bribe. The hierarchical spirit, which here reaches its climax, uses the Roman soldiers merely as tools to effect its own ends, as it had previously employed Judas; and was again fully prepared to let the despised instruments perish, when the work was finished.—**We will persuade him,** πείσομεν. An ironical euphemism, indicating the means of persuasion. This was the manner in which they will keep the soldiers *free of care and danger.*

Ver. 15. **This saying,** ὁ λόγος οὗτος.—This

* [Erasmus: *Si res apud illum judicem agatur.* So also Alford. Comp. my Critical Note No. 4 above.—P. S.]

does not refer to the entire account (Grotius, Paulus), but to the lying statement (ver. 13), voluntarily adopted by these soldiers, that the body of Jesus had been stolen by His disciples (de Wette, Meyer). Upon the doubts regarding the narrative itself, which Stroth maintained to be an interpolation, consult de Wette and Meyer. Among the opponents of the truth of the passage, are Paulus, Strauss, Weisse, Meyer; among the supporters, Hug, Kuinoel, Hoffmann, Krabbe, Ebrard, etc. Olshausen adopts a modified view, that the Sanhedrin did not act in a formal manner, but that Cajaphas arranged the matter privately. The most plausible arguments which de Wette brings forward against the credibility of the narrative, were already disposed of in the *Exegetical Notes* on ch. xxvii. 66 (p. 537). The objection that the Sanhedrin, in which "sat men like Gamaliel," could not have so lost its sense of duty and dignity as to adopt so unworthy a resolution, rests entirely upon a subjective view of the worthiness of the council.* We have already learned from the history of the crucifixion, that it was a Jewish custom to employ bad means to effect the ends of the hierarchy, and to deal with the despised Gentiles as mere tools, who were to be used and then treated with contempt. The existence of this saying among the Jews is acknowledged. See the quotations which Grotius gives out of Justin, from which we learn that the Pharisees spread the report among the people by appointed messengers; and also out of Tertullian. The Talmudic tract, *Toledoth Jeschu*.† That the Evangelist has here communicated to us the prototype of the Talmud, and the Christ-hating Judaism, is a proof of his deep insight into the significance of the facts, and a testimony unto the consistent character of his Gospel.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *Some of the watch.*—The other guards appear to have been so overcome, so prostrated by the phenomena of the resurrection, as to have recognized the matter as settled, the attempt of the chief council as futile, and, without further delay, to have returned to their military station. Only a part so far overcomes the influence as to go and give a report, probably in hopes of having a reward promised to them, and ready to be bribed. Those mercenary soldiers are a type of all "trencher-soldiers," who must supply the hierarchy with power to compensate for their want of spiritual might. The nobler soldier, like the independent state, will not allow it even to be supposed that he will yield himself up as a tool to the hierarchy.

2. The intensified heathenism of the disbelieving Judaism begins with disbelief regarding the resurrection of Jesus, and adopts at once a characteristic trait of heathenism, by forming a dark tradition. But the myth of the chief council is worse than the myths of heathenism. The latter, according to their bright side, point to Christ; but the lie of the Sanhedrin forms the dark contrast to the facts of light recorded in the Gospels. The myths of the heathen world are the seed of its culture;* the lying myth of unbelieving Judaism is the fruit of its obduracy.

3. Matthew, with prophetic spirit, has preserved this fact, the unmistakable germ from which sprang the Talmud, along with which Judaism, that held in the Old Testament fast by the path of faith and repelled all the myths of the heathen world, now manifests itself in its unbelief as the most intensified heathenism; resorting to the most debased of all myths, and endeavoring to destroy the evangelical history by a false exegesis of the Old Testament, by false traditions concerning facts of Gospel history, and by a perversion of the Old Testament into a system of absolute legalism and formalism. Hence it is, that in the following section this type of the Talmud is succeeded by the type of the New Testament.

4. It is indubitable that our narrative is the history of the most extreme self-abasement of the chief council, but is not the less worthy of belief. This is the perfection of the judgment of self-abandonment, under which the council had flung itself. Upon the special points of this self-rejection, *see* the EXEGETICAL NOTES.

5. The hierarchical falsification of the history of the resurrection is the beginning of the hierarchical and antievangelical falsifications of history. The Ebionitic Apocrypha, the *donatio Constantini*, the pseudo-Isidorian Decretals, etc.

6. Christ's resurrection, according to God's counsel, *officially* announced to the civil authorities, and to the hierarchy; and hence the evangelical faith, as belief in the resurrection, is independent and free.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Heathen guards, the messengers whom God had ordained to announce the resurrection unto the chief council.—Despairing sinners (Judas, the guards), the usual preachers of repentance, sent unto the hypocritical, hierarchical powers.—The unbelief of the chief council is bold enough to impart its own obduracy to affrighted Gentile hearts.—Money and bribery, the Α and Ω (the beginning and the end) of the salvation which remained with the council.—Bribery of every kind is the principal lever of all antichristian systems: 1. Bribery by money, 2. by honors.—The utter incertitude of the Sanhedrin is clearly manifested by their last decision.—The perfect overthrow which moral self-destruction caused to follow the supposed triumph of their faith.—The imagination of blinded spirits, as though they could debase the grandest facts of heaven into the meanest stories (*scandala*) of earth.—The fruitless lies, which are imagined capable of converting the most glorious facts into a deceptive myth.—The criticism passed in the dark Jewish lane, upon the facts of Gospel history which took place upon the broad, open highway of the world.—This is the course which all the enemies of Christian truth must pursue, because of the concealed self-contradictions: 1. They imagine the most absurd fables, to destroy the most glorious miracle; 2. they imagine the most senseless absurdity, to destroy what is full of meaning and clear to the soul; 3. they imagine what is mean, wicked, diabolical, to destroy what is sacred.—The latest criticism in the Jewish Talmud, and the Talmud in the

* [Comp. the sharp reply of Ebrard to this objection of Strauss: "What pious and conscientious men the Sanhedrists all at once become under the magic hands of Mr. Dr. Strauss! All the scattered Christians, these humble and quiet men, must, without any cause whatever, have devised and believed a palpable lie; but the murderers of Jesus were altogether too good to devise for the Roman soldiers a falsehood that had become for them a necessity!"—P. S.]

† [This book gives an expansion of this lie of the Jews.—P. S.]

* [In German: *Der Same ihrer Kultur*, which the Edinb. edition turns into "*the germ of its worship*," as if Lange had written: *ihres Kultus*.—P. S.]

latest works of criticism.—How the hierarchy has corrupted even the soldier's honor.—Slander sneaks along in its impotent path, in pursuit of the Gospel rushing along its winged course: 1. Slander of Christ; 2. of the disciples; 3. of early Christendom; 4. of the Reformation, and so forth.—How Judaism and heathenism unite to oppose Christianity.—How the hierarchy leagues with the dissolute to battle against the faith.—The inhabitants of hell try to make themselves believe that heaven has been built up by the devices of hell.—God allowed the work of shame to run its wretched course, because the message of the resurrection was not intended to be extended in the form of worldly, but of heavenly certainty, by heavenly agencies.—Powerless as are such attempts, as concerns the Lord, they succeed in destroying many souls.—Thus has the Talmud, the production of the legalistic spirit of Judaism, placed itself between the poor Jew and his Christ, as a ruinous phantom. So too does the spirit of legalism endeavor to build up a wall of separation between the poor Christian and his Christ.—It is only the preaching of the Gospel which can overcome the enmity to the Gospel.—The more boldly the opposition advances, let the word ring out the clearer.

The Present Section considered in connection with the following Evangelical Narrative.—The twofold development of the Old Testament: 1. The false continuation of the Talmud. 2. The true continuation in the New Testament.—The great revolution in the life of Christ: 1. The apparent triumph of His foes becomes their most disgraceful defeat. 2. The apparent defeat of the Lord becomes His most glorious triumph.—The grand development of Christianity and its dark counter-picture: 1. The fleeing soldiers, the heroic women. 2. The great council, and its decision; Christ upon the mountain, and His sermon. 3. The empty expectations of Judaism, and the actual testimony afforded by the Church of Christ.—The perfect impotence of the opponents, and the omnipotence of Christ in heaven and upon earth.

Starke:—*Nova Bibl. Tub.:* As divine wisdom has decreed, unto even the bitterest foes and persecutors of Jesus must the truth be told by their own beloved confidantes.—The world takes money, and acts as she is taught, against her better knowledge and her conscience, 1 Tim. vi. 10; 2 Pet. ii. 13, 15.—No compacts prevail against the Lord.—The devil seeks, where not by force and with boldness, still with lies and blasphemy, to oppose the kingdom and the life of Christ.—Money has great power, but thou and thy money shall perish together, Acts viii. 20.—Manifest lies require no refutation; they refute themselves.—*Quesnel:* What a misfortune, that a man will turn to lies to cover his sin, rather than unto repentance for forgiveness!—*Zeisius:* The lie, no matter how absurd, is believed rather than the truth, especially by the low and godless masses.—Murder and lies, the devil's weapons, John viii. 44.

Lisco:—Hate and wickedness incite Christ's enemies to bribe the soldiers; low avarice makes them ready to free themselves from the crime of a neglect of duty by availing themselves of a convenient lie.

Heubner:—Contrast between this account and the preceding: 1. There truth; here lies. 2. There the glorified Hero in His perfect purity; here the terrified priesthood, affrighted because of its crime. 3. There, among the disciples, overmastering joy; here anguishing terror. 4. There willing, unpaid servants of truth; here bribed servants of falsehood.—Injustice brings a man to humiliation, shame, before the instruments of his sin: he resigns himself to them, must fear them, and they laugh him to scorn.—Such people have never a clean mouth. The state of things might have been learned by the Apostles from secret friends and adherents among the priests, from several persons, perchance from converted soldiers.

Braune:—As the friends heard from their own, so the foes from their own, the news of the resurrection.—What revelation will be made on the day of judgment* of what money can effect!—Lies find admission, but they flee before the truth. Let no one, accordingly, be affrighted for what men can do; the Lord's counsel stands fast.—But let no one imagine that he must take in hand to destroy the attempts of another; leave that to the Lord.

* [The Edinb. edition mistranslates "*every day we see*," etc.; mistaking the German: *jener Tag* (remember: *Dies iræ, dies illa*) for *jeder Tag*.—P. S.]

THIRD SECTION.

THE OMNIPOTENT RULE, AND THE KINGDOM OF CHRIST, IN HEAVEN AND IN EARTH.

Chapter XXVIII. 16–20.

(Mark xvi. 15–18; Luke xxiv. 44–49.)

16 Then the eleven disciples went away into Galilee, into a [the, τό] mountain where
17 Jesus had appointed them. And when they saw him, they worshipped him:[1] but
18 some doubted.[2] And Jesus came [drew near, προσελθών] and spake unto them, saying,
19 All power is given unto me in [ἐν] heaven and in [on, ἐπί] earth. Go ye therefore,[3]
and teach [make disciples of, or disciple, christianize, μαθητεύσατε][4] all [the, τά] nations,
baptizing[5] them in the name [into the name, εἰς τὸ ὄνομα][6] of the Father, and of the
20 Son, and of the Holy Ghost: Teaching [διδάσκοντες] them to observe all things whatso-

ever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway [all the days, every day, πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας], *even* unto the end [ἕως τῆς συντελείας] of the world [τοῦ αἰῶνος].[7] Amen.[8]

[1] Ver. 17.—Codd. B., D., [also Cod. Sinait.], Vulgate, Chrysostom, and Augustine omit αὐτῷ, and so Lachmann and Tischendorf [not in the large edition of 1859, where he retains it with a majority of uncial MSS.]. Some cursive MSS. read αὐτόν.

[2] Ver. 17.—[Grotius, Doddridge, Newcome, Fritzsche, Scrivener translate ἐδίστασαν: *had doubted*, taking the Greek aorist as a Latin pluperfect. So also the French translations of Martin and Osterwald: *avaient douté*. But this is unnecessary, and grammatically impossible after προσεκύνησαν. Matthew does not say πάντες προσεκύνησαν, and the doubt may be referred (with de Wette and Lange) to the act of worship, and not to the fact of the resurrection. *See Exeg. Notes*. But even if all disciples fell down before the risen Lord, some (not of the eleven, after the two appearances in Jerusalem, John xx., but of the seventy or of the five thousand to whom Christ appeared, 1 Cor. xv. 6) may have done so with the honest scepticism of Thomas, being very anxious, but hardly able as yet to realize such a stupendous miracle. Hence there is no necessity, as there is no critical authority, for Beza's conjecture, substituting οὐδέ for οἱ δέ. —P. S.]

[3] Ver. 19.—The particle οὖν (*therefore*) is wanting in all uncial MSS. [This is not quite correct. The Vatican Codex (B.), both in the edition of Angelo Mai and of Buttmann, has it, as well as some ancient patristic quotations, and hence Lachmann retains it, although in brackets. Some quote also Cod. Ephraemi Syri (C.) in its favor, but this Codex as published by Tischendorf breaks off in this chapter with ver. 14. But eleven uncial MSS. (Codd. Sinait., A., E., F., H., K., M., S.) and numerous cursive copies omit it, and so do the editions of Griesbach, Scholz, Tischendorf, and Alford. But although it is difficult to defend it critically, it certainly accords with the sense. For the glorification of the Son by the Father and His elevation to the right hand of Almighty power is the foundation of the Church and of the authority of the apostolic ministry.—P. S.]

[4] Ver. 19.—[The verb μαθητεύειν (properly an intransitive verb: *to be a pupil to one*, τινί, ch. xxvii. 57 and among the classics, but in the N. T. used also transitively: *to make a disciple of*, τινά, so here, Matt. xiii. 52; Acts xiv. 21, = μαθητὰς ποιεῖν, John iv. 1), is more comprehensive than διδάσκειν, ver. 20, and should therefore be differently rendered in this connection. It signifies the end, the participles the means. The nations are to be made *disciples of Christ* or converted to Him by two means chiefly, viz., by *baptism* (βαπτίζοντες) and by religious *instruction* (διδάσκοντες). The margin of the Authorized Version proposes: *make disciples*, or *Christians of all nations;* Doddridge: *proselyte* (which is objectionable on account of the double meaning); Campbell: *convert;* Norton: *make disciples from all nations* (*from* implies a false restriction); Scrivener: *make disciples of;* Conant and the N. T. of the Am. Bible Union: *disciple* (in the sense: *to convert, to cause to become a follower*). This is certainly shorter than the circumlocution: *to make disciples of*, but perhaps not sufficiently popular. Lange has: *Machet zu Jüngern*, and adds in small type: *bekehret;* de Wette and Ewald: *bekehret*. The *teach* of the Authorized and all the older English Versions (as well as the *lehret* of Luther) comes from the inaccurate rendering of the Vulgata: *docete . . . baptizantes . . . docentes*.—P. S.]

[5] Ver. 19.—The reading: βαπτίσαντες (*having baptized*) of Codd. B., D., instead of βαπτίζοντες, is worthy of notice. [Comp. the translator's foot-note on p. 557.—P. S.].

[6] Ver. 19.—[The preposition εἰς with the accusative, as distinct from ἐν ὀνόματι, strictly conveys the idea: *into the covenant—union and fellowship of the triune God*, with all the privileges and duties involved in it. The common version in the English and German Bibles and baptismal offices arises from the inaccurate rendering of Cyprian (Epist. lxxiii. 5) and of the Vulgata: *in nomine Patris*, etc., instead of *in nomen*, as Tertullian has it (*De Bapt.* c. 13). It may be grammatically defended, however, by ch. xviii. 20: *gathered together in my name*, εἰς τὸ ὄνομα, and x. 41: *in the name of a prophet*, εἰς ὄνομα προφήτου, δικαίου, μαθητοῦ,—the meaning of εἰς being here: *in reference to*. Lange ingeniously combines the two meanings: *in the authority of*, and *into the communion with*, the holy Trinity. *See* his *Exeg. Notes* and my additions; also Lange's *Doctrinal Thoughts*, No. 6.—P. S.]

[7] Ver. 20.—[Lit.: *till the consummation of the* (*present*) *æon* (as distinct from the future æon after the Advent or the never-ending world to come); Lange: *bis an des Weltlauf's Vollendung*. But the common rendering of συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος by *end of the world*, is upon the whole the best, certainly the most popular, and hence we left it undisturbed in the text. It dates from Wiclif, and was retained by all the older versions (except that of Rheims, which has: *to the consummation of the world*, after the Vulgata: *ad consummationem sæculi*), and among recent revisers also by Conant and the N. T. of the Am. Bible Union (with the omission of the interpolated *even*, which dates from Tyndale). Coverdale and James' Revisers have: *unto*, but the Versions of Tyndale, Cranmer, Geneva, and the Bishops have: *until*. The old version is greatly preferable to that of Campbell: *to the conclusion of this state*, and to that of Norton: *to the end of present things*.—P. S.]

[8] Ver. 20.—[The word ἀμήν of the *text. rec.* and younger MSS. is omitted in Codd. Sinait., B., D., etc., Vulgata, etc. It is cancelled by Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford; it is also wanting in the first edition of Erasmus, 1516, and hence in Luther's German Version, and in all the English Versions previous to that of King James' Revisers. The word was probably added by the scribes who prepared the copies for liturgical use.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 16. **Then the eleven disciples.**—They come forward here as the representatives of the entire band of disciples, and not as the select apostolic college of the Twelve, which makes its first reappearance after the selection of Matthias. This distinction is to be found in the remark that *some doubted*, which cannot apply to the Eleven: reference is made to many witnesses in 1 Cor. xv. 6.

Upon the mountain.—The Evangelist himself informs us that Jesus had appointed the place of meeting, but does not tell us *when* and *where*. Inasmuch as the disciples were bidden at first merely to go into Galilee, the more special direction must have been given at a later date. Grotius thinks that the command was issued while they were still in Jerusalem. We agree with Ebrard and others, that Christ's meeting with the seven (John xxi.) preceded and introduced this manifestation. That there is a reference to an actual mountain in Galilee, may be seen from the connection between this passage and the injunctions to proceed into Galilee, vers. 7, 10; also from the consideration, that in Galilee only could a place be found for so large an assemblage of disciples as is mentioned in 1 Cor. xv. 6. An apocryphal tradition, dating from the thirteenth century, named the northern peak of the Mount of Olives as the scene, and gave it the name of Galilæa. This theory has undoubtedly originated early, in an improper and interested attempt at harmonizing, the first traces of which we find in the apocryphal *Actis Pilati*. It is upon this statement that Rudolf Hofmann supports his views in his work, *Ueber den Berg Galiläa, Ein Beitrag zur Harmonie der evangelischen Berichte*.

Leipzig, 1856.* We saw above that Mount Tabor could not have been the scene of the transfiguration. But should we conclude from this, that that tradition is wholly untenable? How easily could that which had been said of the second transfiguration of Jesus before the eyes of His Church, be confounded with the account of the former transfiguration! How well adapted, besides, was Mount Tabor for the accommodation of the disciples, who assembled for the purpose of celebrating the first great Easter festival! That the mount was then peopled, goes against the theory which makes it the scene of such an event as the first transfiguration, but not against the view which selects it as the centre to which the Galilean Christians were gathered. For the dwellers upon this mountain (if the mountain were not then, to some degree, waste and occupied only by ruins; *see* Schulz, *Reisebeschreibung*) could be but few in number, and would be, besides, friendly disposed to the Galilean believers, so that the assemblage upon this high peak of Galilee would not be in the least disturbed (*see* the author's *Leben Jesu*, ii. 3, 1730). Grotius, too, writing upon this passage, is in favor of Tabor. "Southward from the Mount of Beatitudes, six miles distant from Nazareth, in an easterly direction (southeast), the Mount of Tabor rises, תָּבוֹר, *i. e.* peak, navel, Greek Ἰταβύριον (Hos. v. 1; *Sept.*), called by the natives *Tschebel Tor*. It is a great, well-nigh isolated ball of chalkstone, flattened on the top. Jerome says of it: *Mira rotunditate sublimis. In omni parte finitur æqualiter.* Upon the southern side, it extends far down into the plain of Jezreel:† northward it overlooks all the confronting mountains of the highlands of Galilee. The sides of Tabor are covered with a forest of oaks and wild pistachio-trees, which shelter wild swine. The whole mountain is rich in flowers, and abounds with trees. The flat top is about a mile and a half in circumference; upon it are the remains of a large fortress, and two churches may still be recognized." (K. von Raumer, *Palästina*, p. 62.) *See* Jer. xlvi. 18; Ps. lxxxix. 12, ["Tabor and Hermon shall rejoice in thy name"]. Upon the prospect from Tabor, consult works of travel, Schubert, Robinson; also Schulz (Mühlheim an der Ruhr, 1852, p. 260). Gerlach supposes the mountain to have lain in a lonely neighborhood, in Lebanon, in the north of Galilee, but states no reasons.

Ver. 17. **And when they saw Him.**—In the case of the Eleven, this was "neither the first occasion upon which they saw Him since the resurrection, nor yet the first impression." Judging from the import of what follows, we believe that Matthew groups the eleven Apostles together with the assembled pilgrim throng of Galilean believers. To this congregated body does the prostration refer, and also the doubting of some. We consider, however, that the statement: **some doubted,** is not applied to the reality of the Risen One, but is used in regard to the immediately preceding προσεκύνησαν. These "some" were not in doubt whether the person before them was really Jesus who had risen. That would have been a total inversion of the order of things, if they had come to the mountain believing, and had been plunged back into doubt upon the sight of the Lord. Why, it was the very vision of the Lord which made the women and the Eleven believing. So that they doubted whether it was proper to offer unto the Lord such an unbounded worship as was expressed in the supplications and prostration of the disciples. This view is held also by de Wette. The following declaration of Jesus refers to this hesitation. Hence we find in this a prophetic allusion by the Evangelist to that germ of Ebionism which developed itself at a later period among the Jewish Christians, just as he had before pointed out the germ of the antichristian Judaism. These "some"—οἱ δὲ without a preceding οἱ μέν—constitute a particular section of that assembled mass, formerly mentioned as a body, to which special attention would be directed.* The words, οἱ δὲ ἐδίστασαν, have received various explanations. 1. The reading itself, οὐδὲ: Bornemann [Beza]. 2. The meaning, Some prostrated themselves, the others separated in dismay: Schleussner. 3. The occasion: (*a*) They doubted, because Jesus' body was already glorified: Olshausen and others; (*b*) dread of a phantom: Hase; (*c*) on account of a change in the body of Jesus, which was now in the intermediate state, between its former condition, and glorification, which was completed at the ascension: Meyer.† 4. The subject: (*a*) The Eleven were they who doubted: Meyer; (*b*) certain of the Seventy: Kuinoel; (*c*) certain of the five hundred brethren, 1 Cor. xv. 6: Calovius and others [also Olshausen, Ebrard, Stier, who suppose, from the previous announcement of this meeting, and the repetition of that announcement by the angel, and by Christ, that it included, probably, all the disciples who could be brought together;—in which case we must take the ἕνδεκα in ver. 16 in an emphatic, not in an exclusive sense, the Eleven being the natural leaders of the rest.—P. S.] This last explanation is undoubtedly the correct one. (*See* above.)

Ver. 18. **And Jesus drawing near, spake unto them.**—This drawing near was manifestly a special approach unto those who were doubting; and unto them likewise were the following words in the first instance addressed, though not exclusively.

All power is given unto Me.—Expression of His glorification and victory. "It is an unwarranted rationalizing explanation, when this expression is made to mean simply, either *potestas animis hominum per doctrinam imperandi* (Kuinoel), or full power to make all the preparations necessary for the Messianic theocracy (Paulus). It is the *munus regium Christi, without limitation.*" Meyer. According to the doubts of the later Ebionites, Christ must share the power given Him by God, in heaven with the angels, on earth with Moses. [With the resurrection and ascension Christ took full possession, as

* [Hofmann endeavors to harmonize the differences in the history of the forty days by means of this apocryphal tradition; but ἡ Γαλιλαία means nowhere in the N. T. a mountain, but always the well-known province, nor do the fathers use it in any other sense. Comp. Meyer in the fifth edition, p. 618, note.—P. S.]

† [The Edinb. edition reads: *it sinks deep into the Valley of Israel*. I do not know what the "Valley of Israel" is; but Dr. Lange undoubtedly means the great plateau or elevated plain of *Jesreel*, עֵמֶק יִזְרְעֶאל, which extends from Carmel to the Jordan where it leaves the Lake Genegareth, and was celebrated for its beauty and fertility, Josh. xvii. 16; Judg. vi. 33; vii. 1; 1 Sam. xxix. 1, etc.—P. S.]

* [The omission of οἱ μέν implies that those who doubted were a small minority, a mere exception. If Matthew had written: οἱ μὲν προσεκύνησαν, οἱ δὲ ἐδίστασαν, he would have divided the disciples into two co-ordinate and almost equal parts. Comp. Meyer *in loc.*—P. S.]

† [Lange means the late Johann Friedrich von Meyer, the reviser of Luther's German Bible, not to be confounded with Heinrich August Wilhelm Meyer, the commentator still living. As the latter is mentioned immediately afterward, their Christian names should have been given here.—P. S.]

the *Godman*, of that δόξα which, as λόγος ἄσαρκος, or according to His eternal *Divine* nature, He had before the foundation of the world, John xvii. 5; Luke xxiv. 26; Phil. ii. 9–11; Eph. i. 20–23.—P. S.]

Ver. 19. **Go ye** (therefore).—Οὖν is a gloss, but a correct one; for the majesty of Christ is the ground both for His sending, and for their allowing themselves to be sent. [Alford, a dignitary of the Church of England, says of these words of the great commission, that they were "not spoken to the apostles *only*, but to all the brethren." He also remarks on the connection between ἐξουσία and μαθητεύσατε: "All power is given Me—go therefore and—subdue? Not so: the purpose of the Lord is to bring men to the *knowledge of the truth*—to work on and in their hearts, and lift them up to be partakers of the Divine nature! And therefore it is not 'subdue,' but '*make disciples of*.'"—P. S.]

Make disciples of, μαθητεύσατε.—Luther's translation: *lehret*, is incorrect.* So also is the Baptist exegesis: In every case, first complete religious instruction, then baptism. To make disciples of, involves in general, it is true, the preaching of the Gospel; but it marks pre-eminently the moment when the non-Christian is brought to a full willingness to become a Christian, that is, has become, through repentance and faith, a catechumen. This willingness, in the case of the children of Christian parents, is presupposed and implied in the willingness of the parents; for it is unnatural and unspiritual to treat children as if they were adults, and Christianity as if it were a mere school question, when the parents do not decide unhesitatingly in favor of Christianity as the religion of their children, and do not determine to educate them accordingly. Hence the children of Christian parents are born catechumens, or subjects of Christian instruction. The Holy Scriptures everywhere place the spiritual unity of the household in the believing father or believing mother, representing this as the normal relation.

All nations.—Removal of the limitations laid down in ch. x. 5, according to the statements contained in ch. xxv. 32; xxiv. 14. By this, the universality of the apostolic commission is established. The question, how the Gentiles are to be received into the Church, is not yet answered, though the unconditioned reception of believers is found in the appointment, that nations, as nations, are to be christianized, without being first made Jews; that they are to be marked out as Christians by baptism, without any reference to circumcision. The development of this germ is left by the Lord to the work of the Spirit. The revelation recorded Acts x., is the Spirit's exegesis of the already perfect commission, and not a continuation or expansion of that commission, which was completed with the work of Christ. We cannot, therefore, assume that the Apostles, up to that time, held circumcision to be a necessary condition of baptism, or reception into the Church; they were merely in the dark regarding this question, until the Holy Spirit explained the word of Christ unto them.

Baptizing them.—Or, more correctly according to the reading βαπτίσαντες: *having baptized them*.† But μαθητεύειν is not completed in baptism. Rather are there two acts, a missionary and an ecclesiastical,—the antecedent baptism, the subsequent instruction. [Meyer: "βαπτίζοντες, etc., by which the μαθητεύειν is to be brought about, not what is to take place *after* the μαθητεύσατε, which would require μαθητεύσαντες-βαπτίζετε." Alford: "The μαθητεύειν consists of two parts—the *initiatory*, admissory *rite*, and the *subsequent teaching*. It is much to be regretted that the rendering of μαθ., '*teach*,' has in our Bibles clouded the meaning of these important words. It will be observed that in our Lord's words, as in the Church, the process of ordinary discipleship is *from baptism to instruction*—*i. e.*, is *admission in infancy to the covenant*, and *growing up into* τηρεῖν πάντα, κ. τ. λ." But this applies only to Christian churches already established. As the Jewish religion commenced with the promise of God, and the faith and circumcision of *adult* Abraham, who received circumcision as a sign and seal of the covenant already established (Rom. iv. 11) for himself and for his seed, so the Christian Church was founded in the beginning, and is now propagated in all heathen countries by the preaching of the Gospel to, and by the baptism of, *adults*. Infant baptism always presupposes the existence of a responsible *parent* church and the guaranty of Christian nurture which must develop and make available the blessings of the baptismal covenant. Hence the preponderance of adult over infant baptism in the first centuries of Christianity, and in all missionary stations to this day. But even in the case of adult converts, a *full* instruction in the Christian religion and development of Christian life, does not, as a rule, precede, but succeed baptism, which is an initiatory, not a consummatory rite, the sacramental sign and seal of regeneration, *i. e.*, of the beginning of the new life, not of sanctification or growth and perfection in holiness.—P. S.]

In [or rather **with reference to**, or **into**] **the name of.***—That is, in the might of, and for, the name, as the badge and the symbol of the new Church. Εἰς τό. "Note," says Meyer, "that the liturgical formula, *In nomine*, *In the name*, rests entirely upon the incorrect translation of the Vulgate." Yet, not so *entirely*, because the expression ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι is found in Acts x. 48 (compare Matt. iii. 11). De Wette and Meyer explain εἰς τό, *with reference to* the name. But εἰς τό, in other passages, means either the element into which one is baptized (Mark i. 9, εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην; Rom. vi. 3, εἰς τὸν θάνατον); or the object, εἰς μετάνοιαν, Matt. iii. 11; Acts ii. 38, εἰς ἄφεσιν; or the authority of the community, under which and for which one is baptized (εἰς τὸν Μωϋσῆν, 1 Cor. x. 2). The last meaning is probably the prominent one in this passage: a baptism under the authority of, and unto the authority of the triune God, as opposed to the baptism in and for the authority of Moses. But, as the context shows, we have expressed likewise the idea of being plunged into the name of the Three-one God, as the element, and

* [So is the *teach* of the English Version, and the *doceto* of the Latin Vulgate. Comp. the Critical Note No. 4, p. 555.—P. S.]

† [The reading βαπτίσαντες has the authority of only two, though very important uncial MSS., the Vatican (B.) and the Cambridge Codex (Codex Bezæ or D.), and looks very much like an ecclesiastical correction. The Sinaitic Codex, which otherwise so often agrees with Cod. B., sustains here the *text. rec.*, and all the modern critical editions Lachmann, Tischendorf, Alford, etc., read the present participle βαπτίζοντες. Meyer, otherwise so careful in grammatical and critical matters, does not even notice the difference of reading in this case.—P. S.]

* [Lange, as also de Wette, Stier, and Ewald, translate εἰς τὸ ὄνομα: *auf den Namen*, while Luther, following the Latin Vulgate, translates *in dem Namen*, like our English Version. *See* the Critical Note No. 6, p. 555.—P. S.]

the dedication of the baptized unto this name.* The expression, ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι, Acts ii. 38, brings out most fully the idea of the authority, in virtue of which, or the foundation upon which, baptism is administered. In so far, now, as baptism has the Triune name as *ground*, *means*, and *object*, the combined signification of εἰς may be partially explained by *with reference to;* more distinctly, however, *in the name of:* that is, upon the ground of this name, in the might of this name, as dedicated unto this name, or for this name. Meyer: "The name of the Father, etc., is to be the object of faith, and the subject of confession." This expresses only the third conception, and that but half. Upon the import of the *name*, *see* Commentary on Matt. vi. 9 [p. 125].† The name refers to each of the Persons of the Godhead. The plural form, τὰ ὀνόματα, would have pointed to Tritheism; while the singular, in its distributive application to Father, Son, and Spirit, brings out in the *one name* the equality as well as the personality, of the three Divine Names in one name.‡ In an emphatic sense, may it also be said, that τὸ πνεῦμα ἅγιον is a "distinctively Christian *characteristicum* of the Spirit" (John vii. 39).

We must dissent from Meyer, when he maintains that the passage is "improperly termed the *baptismal formula*," assigning as reason that "Jesus does not, assuredly, dictate the *words* which are to be employed in the administration of baptism. (No trace is to be found of the employment of these words by the Apostolic Church: compare rather the simple form εἰς Χριστόν, Rom. vi. 3; Gal. iii. 27; βαπτίζειν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα X., Acts viii. 16; and ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι X., Acts ii. 38.) It is the telic import [or intention] of the baptismal act that is given in this expression. Consult Reiche, *De Baptism. orig.*, etc., Göttingen, 1816, p. 141. It was only at a later period that the baptismal formula was drawn up according to these words (*see* Justin. *Apol.* i. 61), just as was the baptismal confession of the three articles." But it is exactly this gradual development of the apostolical confession of faith which conducts us back to the germ, which we find here deposited in the New Testament. A baptism in the name of Christ is conceivable only when that confession was accompanied by the acknowledgment of the Father and the Holy Spirit; and this so-called "telic import" points us back to the homogeneous foundation upon which that import rests. It is true, indeed, that the apostolic age was not bound to formulas, as stiff and dead formulas. Otherwise, Meyer is right in defending, against the objections of de Wette, Strauss, and others, the historical truth of this direction of Christ. This is not the only instance in which we have presented a more specially defined statement of the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, and of the essential points of the Christian confession (*see* 2 Cor. xiii. 13; 1 Tim. iii. 16; Tit. ii. 11, 13, etc.). [Comp. the *Doctrinal Thoughts*, below, sub No. 6.]

Ver. 20. **Teaching them.**—These words mark, on the one hand, the continuation of the apostolic activity, after that μαθητεύειν and βαπτίζειν had preceded; upon the other, the course of the Christian, which should run on parallel to this activity. The statement concerning the new ἐντολή, John xiii. 34, which refers undoubtedly to the institution of the Holy Supper, shows us, that ALL THINGS commanded by Christ concentrate in the truth, and the spiritual observance of that Supper as necessarily following baptism and the establishment of the visible church. *See* the author's *Leben Jesu*, ii. 3, p. 1330.

[We should not overlook that there is no καί before διδάσκοντες, so that *baptizing* and *teaching* are not strictly coördinate, as two successive acts and means of Christianizing the nations; but the *teaching* is a continuous process, which partly precedes baptism, as a general exhibition of the gospel with the view to bring the adults to the critical turning point of decision for Christ, and submission to His authority, and partly follows baptism, both in the case of adults and infants, as a thorough indoctrination in the Christian truth, and the building up of the whole man unto the full manhood of Christ, the author and finisher of our faith. Since the eleven apostles and other personal disciples of our Lord could neither baptize nor teach all nations, it is evident that He instituted here the office of a continuous and unbroken *preacherhood* (not *priesthood* in the Jewish or Romish sense) and *teacherhood*, with all its duties and functions, its privileges and responsibilities; and to this office He pledged His perpetual presence to the end of time, without the intermission of a single day or hour.—P. S.]

[All things, whatsoever I have commanded you.—The doctrines and precepts of Christ, nothing

* [So also two distinguished modern English commentators. ALFORD *in loc.:* "It is unfortunate again here that our English Bibles do not give us the force of this εἰς. It should have been *into* (as in Gal. iii. 27) both here and in 1 Cor. x. 2, and wherever the expression is used. It imports not only a *subjective recognition* hereafter by the child of the truth implied in τὸ ὄνομα, κ.τ.λ., but an *objective admission* into the covenant of redemption—a *putting on of Christ.* Baptism is the *contract of espousal* (Eph. v. 26) between Christ and His Church. Our word '*in*' being retained both here and in our formula of Baptism, it should always be remembered that *the sacramental declaration is contained in this word;* that it answers (as Stier has well observed, *Reden Jesu*, vi. 902) to the τοῦτό ἐστιν in the other sacrament." Similarly Wordsworth, who otherwise adheres very closely to ancient usage: "Not *in*, but *into;* and not *names* (plural), but into the *One name; i. e.*, admit them by the sacrament of Baptism into the privileges and duties of faith in, and obedience to, the name of the one God, in three persons . . . and into participation of, and communion with, the divine nature." Conant, on the other hand, retains and defends the Authorized Version *in the name* (though not in the sense: by the authority of, but *in reference to*), and denies that *into the name* gives the sense, and is admissible in English. But the Authorized Version renders ὅσοι ἐβαπτίσθημεν εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, Rom. vi. 3: "so many of us as were baptized *into* Jesus Christ," the βάπτισμα εἰς θάνατον, ver. 4: "baptism *into* death," and εἰς Χριστὸν ἐβαπτίσθητε, Gal. iii. 27: "baptized *into* Christ." Why not say then with equal propriety: to baptize *into the name of* Christ, *i. e.*, into communion and fellowship with Him and the holy Trinity as revealed in the work of creation, redemption, and regeneration?—P. S.]

† [The *name* signifies the meaning and essence of the subject *as revealed*, the copy or expression of the being. In this case the name implies all that belongs to the manifestation of the triune God in the gospel, His titles, attributes and works of creation, redemption, and sanctification. It is probable that Christ had reference also to His own baptism in Jordan, where all three persons of the Godhead revealed themselves.—P. S.]

‡ [Meyer (p. 619, 5th ed. of 1864) thinks that, doctrinally, the singular τὸ ὄνομα can be used neither in favor of the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity (as is done by Basil, Jerome, Theophylact, and others), nor in favor of the Sabbellian view of a mere nominal Trinity, since the singular signifies the definite name of each one of the three, so that εἰς τὸ ὄνομα must be supplied before τοῦ υἱοῦ and before τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, comp. Apoc. xiv. 1: τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ. But he admits that the New Testament doctrine of the holy Trinity as the sum and substance of the whole Christian faith and confession is presupposed and implied in the passage.—The old practice of a *threefold* immersion, which is first mentioned by Tertullian, is a venerable usage, but cannot be traced to the apostolic age, nor is it at all required by the trinitarian formula.—P. S.]

.ess and nothing more, are the proper subjects of Christian faith and practice, and constitute the *genuine* Christian tradition to be handed down from age to age, as distinct from those pseudo-Christian traditions of men which were added to the gospel, as the pseudo-Jewish traditions of the Pharisees and elders were added to the Old Testament, and "made the word of God of none effect," Matt. xv. 6.—P. S.]

And, lo.—Excitation and encouragement to fulfil the apostolic commission, and the duties of the Christian life, which are here enjoined.*

I am with you.—Not merely through the agency of the power which has been given Me, but still more in the other person of the Holy Spirit, or the Paracletos (John xiv. 16, 26, etc.), and in My own personal agency, through My word (John xiv. 23) and sacrament (Matt. xxvi. 28). There is reference also to their vital union to, and communion with, Him, in the might of His Spirit (John xiv. 20; xvi. 22), and of His life (John xv. 5). [Alford: "'*I*,' in the fullest sense: not the Divine Presence as distinguished from the Humanity of Christ. His Humanity is with us likewise. The vine lives in the branches. . . . The presence of Christ is part of the ἐδόθη above—the effect of the well-pleasing of the Father. So that the mystery of His name, ἐμμανουήλ, is fulfilled—*God with us*."—P. S.]

[**With you.**—Wordsworth, like the Romish interpreters, erroneously *confines* μεθ' ὑμῶν to the apostles and their successors in office. Let us quote Alford, also a dignitary of the Episcopal Church, against him: "To understand μεθ' ὑμῶν only of the apostles and their (?) successors, is to destroy the whole force of these most weighty words. Descending even into literal exactness, we may see that διδάσκοντες αὐτοὺς τηρεῖν πάντα ὅσα ἐνετειλάμην ὑμῖν, makes αὐτούς into ὑμεῖς, as soon as they are μεμαθητευμένοι. The command is to the UNIVERSAL CHURCH—to be performed, in the nature of things, by her *ministers* and *teachers*, the manner of appointing which is not here prescribed, but to be learnt in the unfoldings of Providence recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, who by His special ordinance were the founders and first builders of that Church—but whose office, *on that very account, precluded the idea of succession or renewal*." In a general sense, however, the apostolic office—the only one which Christ founded, but which was the fruitful germ of all other ministerial offices (the presbyterate and deaconate)—is truly and really continued, with all its necessary functions for the preservation and propagation of the church, in the ministerial or pastoral office. In this passage the apostles and other disciples (there were, probably, more than five hundred in all, comp. 1 Cor. xv. 6) appear as the representatives of the whole ministry of the gospel, and in a wider sense of the whole church over against the unchristian world, which is to be christianized by them. As the Saviour prayed not for the apostles alone, "but for them also that shall believe on Him through their word, that they all may be one" (John xvii. 20, 21), so the promise of His abiding presence is to all ministers of the gospel and to the whole Church they represent. Christ has abundantly proved, and daily proves, His blessed presence in non-episcopal, as well as episcopal churches, even where only two or three humble disciples are assembled in His name (Matt. xviii. 20), and it is our duty and privilege, in the spirit of true evangelical catholicity, to acknowledge and revere the footprints of our Saviour in all ages and sections of Christendom, whether Greek, or Latin, or Anglican, or Protestant.—P. S.]

Alway.*—The words: πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας, *every day*, mark not only every year which will elapse till the world's end, as years of redemption, but also every day, even the darkest, as days of redemption. [ALFORD: "All the appointed days—for they are numbered by the Father, though by none but Him." WORDSWORTH: "I shall never be absent from you a single day; I shall never be absent in any of the days of the greatest trial and affliction of the Church; but I shall remain with her till the *last* day, when you will see Me again in bodily presence."—P. S.]

Unto the end of the world.—That is, until the completion or consummation of the secular æon, or the period of time which comes to an end with the *parousia*, and involves the end of the present world itself. Hence this fact is also included, that Christ accompanies His own, when they go to the most remote boundaries of the world to preach the Gospel. [The word *unto* (ἕως) does not set a term to Christ's presence, but to His *invisible* and *temporal* presence, which will be exchanged for His *visible* and *eternal* presence at His last coming. Now Christ is *with us*, then when He shall appear in glory, we shall be *with Him* where He is (John xvii. 24), and shall see Him as He is (1 John iii. 2). Comp. Bengel, who remarks to ἕως: "*Tum enim nos erimus cum Domino*."—P. S.]

On account of this all-encompassing, this heaven-and-earth-including presence of Christ, the fact of the personal *ascension* is omitted by our Evangelist, which is done also by John, as a point which is self-evidently comprehended in this omnipresence. [The *fact* itself of the ascension is clearly implied, not only in this verse, but also in other passages of this Gospel, as ch. xxii. 44; xxiv. 30; xxv. 14, 31; xxvi. 64.—P. S.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *The mountain in Galilee.*—The appearance of the risen Lord upon this mountain recalls in its every part the transfiguration upon the mountain in Peræa, and also Peter's confession, which preceded that transfiguration. Hence it is, it seems to us, that tradition has connected the second event with the first, in regard to the locality, and has named Mount Tabor as the scene of the transfiguration. Upon this occasion we have a repetition of both the solemn confession and the transfiguration. The two scenes agree in kind, but this present one surpasses in degree. There, Peter confessed: "Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God;" here, a disciple-band of more than five hundred believers fall in adoration at the feet of the risen Lord. There, Christ confirmed Peter's confession, as a revelation from the Father; here, He declares: "All power is given unto Me in heaven and on earth." There, He proclaimed the institution of His Church (ἐκκλησία) upon the foundation of this confession; here, He appoints His disciples apostles unto all nations, while these nations were to take the place of the disciples (μαθητεύσατε), He institutes holy baptism, and recalls the more

* [So also Meyer. Alford gives the words: καὶ ἰδού, a different meaning which is rather far fetched, by referring them to the *ascension*, the manner of which is not related by Matthew.—P. S.]

* [Lange: *alle Tage*, *all the days*, which is the literal translation.—P. S.]

special institution of the ministerial (*teaching*) office (John xx. 21), and of the Holy Supper (*see* above, *Exeg. Notes*).—And as He made manifest, upon the Mount of Transfiguration, His connection with the heavenly world of spirits, and with the entire past of God's kingdom (Moses and Elijah), so He certifies here His connection with the entire future of God's kingdom, His eternal presence in the Church in this world, by means of these words: "Lo, I am with you every day till the completion of the æon, of the world's course and time."

2. When Matthew mentions in this passage only the Eleven, he will merely mark them out as the leaders of the Galilean disciple-procession, but in no sense as those to whom the institutions of the glorified Lord were exclusively entrusted. Gerlach is of the opinion, that the principal, the predominating thought with Matthew, was the office of public teacher; "and hence it is that all the appearances of our Lord, which were enjoyed by different parties, are omitted." But Matthew reports even an appearance of Jesus unto the women. If Matthew here records (as Gerlach himself admits) the same meeting of Jesus with the disciples which is mentioned by Paul, 1 Cor. xv. 6, it follows that the Lord himself here committed His formal institutions and commissions to the whole assembled Church, with the Apostles at her head, just as He at a later date poured out His Spirit upon the whole assembled Church. And from this, then, we argue, that, according to the law of Christ, the apostolic office and the Church are not two divided sections. In the commission to teach and to baptize, the apostolical community is one, a united apostolate, involving the Church, or, a united Church, including the Apostles. In this unity we may unquestionably mark the distinction between the leader and the led, which comes out in a more positive way in the entrustment to the Apostles of the official keys (Matt. xvi. 19; xviii. 18; John xx. 21). But that is an organic contrast, arising from, and conditioned by, the unity of the apostolic communion (1 Cor. v. 4).

3. The declaration of Christ: "All power," etc., and His command to baptize into the name of the Father, and of the Son, etc., as also the fact that He received the adoring homage of His disciples, show clearly that He presented Himself, not only in the majesty of His exalted humanity, but also in the brightness of His divinity. In the words: "is given unto Me," there is, undoubtedly, emphasis laid upon His mediatorial relationship, which is frequently illustrated by the Apostle (1 Cor. xv. 28; Eph. i. 20; Phil. ii. 9 ff.); but, at the same time, with equal distinctness is the *homoousia* (or co-equality) of Christ with the Father and the Holy Spirit expressed in the second name of the baptismal formula. Under the old economy, the predominant reference in all the divine government was to the glorification of the Father; under the new economy, to that of the Son; while, in the final completion, the Father shall be glorified with the Son in the glorification of the Holy Spirit.

4. It is manifest that the kingdom which Christ here describes is not only a *regnum gratiæ*, but also a kingdom of power, and a kingdom of glory; but it does not manifest itself as three distinct kingdoms, but the power which He manifests is subservient to the interests of the kingdom of grace, and the kingdom of grace finds its end and completion in the kingdom of glory (*see* the author's *Positive Dogmatik*).

5. That the Anabaptists appeal for their views without sufficient reason to ver. 19, has been often enough pointed out (*see* the *Exeg. Notes*). But, upon the other hand, it is clearly presupposed in μαθητεύσατε, that persons are to be induced to be baptized by the use of gospel means, not by forcible conversion,—are not to be made catechumens by compulsion; and also, that baptism can be administered to children really only upon the ground of a truly Christian family, or at least of a god-parentship (sponsorship) which represents spiritually such a family. On the baptism of children, consult W. Hoffmann: *Gespräche über Taufe und Wiedertaufe;* Culmann *Welche Bewandtniss hat es mit der Taufe?* Strassburg, 1847; the writings of MARTENSEN, RUDELBACH, etc. [Comp. also, on the *pædo*-Baptist side of the question: P. SCHAFF: *History of the Apostolic Church*, New York ed., 1853, § 142, 143, pp. 569–531; P. SCHAFF: *History of the Christian Church of the First Three Centuries*, New York, 1859, p. 122 ff.; W. WALL (Episcopalian): *The History of Infant Baptism*, 2d ed., Oxford, 1844, 4 vols.; SAMUEL MILLER (Presbyterian): *Infant Baptism Scriptural and Reasonable*, etc., Philad., 1840; W. NAST (Methodist): *A Dissertation on Christian Baptism*, Cincinnati, 1864 (at the close of his Com. on Matthew, p. 641–652). On the *Baptist* side of the question, both in regard to infant baptism and immersion, compare the learned and able works of ALEXANDER CARSON: *Baptism in its Mode and Subjects*, 5th Am. ed., 1850, and, as regards the mode of baptism, Dr. T. J. CONANT: *The Meaning and Use of Baptizein Philologically and Historically Investigated*, being an Appendix to his revised Version of the Gospel of Matthew, New York, 1860, and also separately printed by the Am. Bible Union, New York, 1861.—P. S.]

6. *In* (*into*) *the name.*—As we saw before, the name is not the essence itself, but the expression, the manifestation of the essence, among those of God's intelligent creatures who name the name. So then, In (into) the name (εἰς τὸ ὄνομα) of the Triune, signifies: 1. The *ground;* (*a*) objectively: according to His revelation, under His authority, by reason of His command, and agreeably to His institution; (*b*) subjectively: upon the confession of this name. 2. The *means;* (*a*) objectively: into the revelation of His name as the spiritual element; (*b*) subjectively: for the revelation of His name in the actual confession. 3. The *object;* (*a*) objectively: for the glorification of the Triune name in the subject baptized; (*b*) subjectively: for the happiness* of the baptized in the Triune name. All the significations are combined in, and expressed by εἰς τὸ ὄνομα. Gerlach says: "To do something in the name of God, means, not only: *upon His commission*, but to do it in such a manner that the power and being of God Himself shall appear as working in the transaction. Thus: to bless in the name of the Lord (2 Sam. vi. 18; Ps. cxxix. 8); to adjure one in the name of the Lord (1 Kings xxii. 16); to curse one (2 Kings ii. 24); above all, to pray in Jesus' name (John xvi. 23)." The person baptized is, accordingly, "fully committed unto the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit—consecrated

* [In German: *zur Beseligung*, which the Edinb. edition misrenders: *to seal*, as if *Beseligung* were the same with *Versiegelung!* The objective end of baptism (and of man) is the glory of God, the subjective end the happiness and salvation of the persons baptized by introducing them into the communion with God. The Westminster Catechism combines the two in the first question: "What is the chief end of man? To glorify God and to enjoy Him forever."—P. S.]

made over to experience the blessing, the redeeming and sanctifying influences, of each of the three Persons; hence, also, he is even named by the name of the Lord (Isa. xliii. 7; lxiii. 19; Jer. xv. 16)."

Baptism is, after the analogy of the circumcision, a covenant transaction, more particularly the *dedicatory* covenant transaction, the sacrament of regeneration, to which the Lord's Supper corresponds, as the *completed* covenant act, as the sacrament of sanctification. Baptism represents the *birth*, the Supper the *festive manifestation* of Christianity. Considered in this light, however, we must bring out prominently these three points: (1) God in this covenant is its author, who invites, reconciles, lays down conditions, and that all the vows and performances of men are to rest upon God's promises. (2) The promises of God are promises and assurances of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, in which the personal Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, specializing and individualizing the Gospel, makes Himself over, with all His own peculiar gifts, to each individual subject of baptism; the Father, with the blessing of creation and regeneration; the Son, with the blessing of history, *i. e.*, of salvation; the Holy Spirit, with the blessing of His life and of the (*entire*) Church. This promise contains the assurance of the paternal guardianship and blessing of God, of the grace and merit of Christ, of the consolation, illumination, and direction of the Holy Spirit. But all this under the condition of the subject's own personal appropriation and application. (3) And in accordance with this, we must direct attention to the vows presented to the Father, the Son, and the Spirit. In the case of children, these vows are made by parents or god-parents (sponsors); and where these guarantees are entirely wanting, there is the limit of Christian infant baptism.

7. *In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.*—"This passage is the chief proof of the doctrine of the Trinity. (1) These three must be subjects distinct from one another, and true persons, especially because τὸ ὄνομα is never in the entire Bible used of *abstractis*, of qualities, but only of true persons. (2) They must be equal, consequently divine persons, because they are placed upon an equality, and because like reverence is claimed for each. Even Julian the Apostate acknowledged the force of this passage, and accused the Christians of being polytheists." So Heubner. This taunt is to be avoided by our showing no favor to the vulgar conception of three distinct Divine beings and individuals, and by holding fast to three personal distinctions in the one divine being. For more exact details, *see* the works upon systematic theology. We would only add, that the doctrine of the Trinity is to be regarded as the fundamental, *theological* doctrine of Christianity, to which the *soteriological* doctrines of election, of the atonement, and the Church correspond.

[It should be added, that the doctrine of the Trinity does not rest, by any means, merely on the few *dicta probantia* which teach it directly and expressly, as the baptismal formula, the apostolic benediction, 2 Cor. xiii. 13, and the doubtful passage on the three witnesses in heaven, 1 John v. 7 (comp. besides Matt. iii. 16, 17; 1 Pet. i. 2; Rev. i. 4, 5), but still more on facts, on the whole Scripture revelation of God as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit in the three great works of creation, redemption, and sanctification. From this Trinity of revelation (œconomical Trinity) we justly infer the Trinity of essence (ontological Trinity), since God reveals Himself as He actually is, and since there can be no contradiction between His character and His works. Moreover, every one of the many passages which separately teach either the divinity of our Saviour, or the divinity of the Holy Spirit, viewed in connection with the fundamental Scripture doctrine of the unity of the Godhead, proves, indirectly, also the doctrine of the holy Trinity. Hence you cannot deny this fundamental doctrine without either running into Tritheism, or into Deism, without destroying either the divine unity, or the divinity of Christ and the Holy Spirit, and thereby undermining the whole work of redemption and sanctification.—P. S.]

8. *Institution of the Church.*—With this apostolic commission, and with the institution of baptism, which had been preceded by that of the Supper and of the ministerial office, and by the presentation of the "keys," the institution of the Church is finished, as regards her elements. This can be doubted only, when we ignore that the essence of the Christian Church consists in the communion of the word and the sacraments of Christ, that the word calls the Church into being, that baptism is the foundation, and the communion in a more special sense is the manifestation, of the Church. The doubt whether Christ Himself founded the Church, originated with those who sought the nature of the Church in her policy, or external social organization and constitution; as, *e. g.*, J. H. Böhmer, G. J. Plank (*Geschichte der christlichen Gesellschaftsverfassung*, i. p. 17. We may notice in passing, that the germs of Baur's "*Ebinioten Hypothese*" are to be found p. 9. in this book). The evangelical history teaches us that the institution of the Church arose first gradually, that the institution was announced and prepared for in the word ἐκκλησία, Matt. xvi. 18; was decided by the fact of Christ's death and resurrection; and completed, when the Spirit was poured out at Pentecost. Then it was that the organism of the Church, which the Lord had gradually formed, received the quickening Spirit.

9. *The resurrection as the Lord's exaltation.*—Because Matthew and John do not record the ascension, some have drawn conclusions from this silence adverse to the reality of the ascension. These deductions rest upon two essential errors. The first error concerns the character of the evangelical writings: the Evangelists are held to have been chroniclers, who relate all they know of Jesus. But we have already shown how far they surpassed these demands; that each Evangelist viewed his materials, and arranged them, influenced by a conception of the Lord's glory peculiar to himself, and according to one plastic, fundamental thought. But far below a proper appreciation of the Gospels as this error lies, equally far below a proper appreciation of the resurrection of Christ, in its full, eternal significance, does the second error lie. Some, in accordance with the low belief of the Middle Ages, have conceived the resurrection to have been a kind of awaking, on the Lord's part, unto a life in this world similar to that of Lazarus, so that possibly He might have died again. Then the ascension came in, as the second, entirely new, and in fact much greater miracle, and decided the matter then, and only then. This may be the view of monks of the Middle Ages, but it is not the view of the Apostolic Church. According to the true conception, the ascension is essentially implied in the resurrection. Both events are combined in the one fact of Christ's exaltation. The resurrection is the root and the beginning of the ascension; the ascen-

sion is the blossom and crown of the resurrection. Hence the Apostolic writings take the ascension always for granted (Acts ii. 31, 33; v. 31; vii. 55; Eph. i. 20; ii. 6; iv. 8; Phil. ii. 6–10; 1 Tim. iii. 16; 1 Pet. iii. 32). The ascension is as really presupposed by John (vi. 62; * xx. 17) and by Matthew (xxvi. 64) as it is distinctly related by Mark and Luke. The Lord did not return again after His resurrection into this present life; and yet quite as little did He, as a simple, spiritual existence, enter into the unseen world. He has become through the resurrection, which was at the same time transformation, the first-fruits of the new spiritual human life of glorified humanity; hence is He the Prince of the visible and the invisible worlds, which find here the point of union (Eph. i. 21). But this life, as regards its essence, is the heavenly life; and, as regards its character, the entrance into that estate was accordingly the beginning of the ascension. We cannot indeed say (with Kinkel), that the early Church identified the resurrection and the ascension; or, that the latter occurred upon the first day of the resurrection; or, that there was a succession of ascensions. The resurrection marks the entrance into the heavenly *state*; the ascension, into the heavenly *sphere*. With the first, the manner of His former intercourse with the disciples ceased, and was replaced by His miraculous appearances; with the last, His visible intercourse with the disciples generally ceased, to give place to the sending of the Paraclete, the Holy Spirit. This is the reason why the ascension presents a sad side as well as a joyful, being the departure of Jesus from the earth. It is both Good Friday and Easter. By it the Church of Christ is marked out as both a Church of the cross and a Church of the crown, and enters upon a course of conflict which lasts from Pentecost to the second Advent. Christ's ascension is accordingly His proper *glorification*, as the resurrection His *transformation*. Nevertheless, the unity of the exaltation of Christ predominates to such a degree in the apostolic view, that the final ascension is taken for granted by the Apostles. John sees the image of the ascension in this, that Christ will continue to live in the Petrine and Johannean type of the Church; Matthew in this, that He will be with His own till the completion of the world, hence omnipresent with His people in His majesty, as regards both time and space. Such a spiritual dynamic omnipresence of Christ is conceivable only upon the precondition of the ascension. That "the feast of the Ascension did not make its appearance until a late period" (Gerlach), is to be explained by the fact, that originally the forty days of the glorification of Christ made up one continuous festival. Then the ascension rose just in proportion as the festival of the Forty Days sank. Upon the *corporeality* of the risen Saviour, *see* Lange's *Leben Jesu*, ii. 3, p. 1750. In that work, we have considered connectedly the conceptions of transformation and glorification, as is usually done; and this is so far justifiable, as transformation is the basis of glorification. But the latter, which is the fully developed bloom of transformation, does not fully manifest itself till Christ's appearance upon the mountain in Galilee, and till the ascension.

10. Matthew's three sacred mountains: (1) The Mount of the Seven Beatitudes; (2) the Mount of Transfiguration; (3) the Mount of the great Resurrection-festival. (De Wette: The self-inauguration of Jesus,—Transfiguration,—Farewell.)

* [Ver. 22 is a printing error of the original faithfully reproduced in the Edinb. edition, which adds other errors, as Matt. xxvi. 24, instead of 64, etc.—P. S.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The revelation of our risen Lord in the great congregation of the disciples upon the mountain: 1. The festival which succeeded the Palm-entry, after they had been scattered. 2. The festival which preceded the feast of Pentecost, when they became perfectly united. 3. The festival of Easter in its complete form.—How great the gain when we believingly repair to the place where the Lord has commanded us to go: 1. In the Lord's house; 2. at the Lord's table; 3. before the Lord's throne.—The believing Church is constituted by its appearance before the Lord: 1. It is only the appearance before the Lord which makes a true Church; the appearance before men can form only a picture of a Church, or a party. 2. The appearance before the Lord truly unites the everlasting Church.—The Easter Church, kneeling before her Lord, receives His Easter blessing: 1. The kneeling Church. 2. The Easter blessing: (*a*) the most blessed assurance that His royal glory is her shield and salvation; (*b*) the most extensive commission unto all the world with His salvation; (*c*) the solemn assurance of His presence and His conduct to the end of the world.—How Christ replies to doubters in His Church: 1. By a reference to His unbounded power; 2. by the institution of His unbounded Church; 3. by the assurance of His ever-abiding presence.—The believing Church participates in the glory of her glorified Lord: 1. She shares His might, in the guardianship and blessing which she experiences; 2. she shares His fulness of grace, in the office she discharges; 3. she shares His victory, in the assurance received by her.—The risen Saviour in His majesty: 1. In His royal glory; 2. in His divine glory; 3. in the glory of His victory.—All power in heaven and upon earth united in the Lord for His people.—Jesus' omnipotence, an omnipotence of grace, and an omnipotence of judgment.—The Church's institution and commission is one: 1. The institution, a commission; 2. the commission, an institution.—Holy baptism, as the foundation of Christ's Church: 1. The pre-condition, catechumens who have been won by the gospel; 2. its meaning, the covenant grace of the Triune God; 3. its object, the holy communion and its blessing.—Baptism in the name of the Triune God, the celebration of a personal covenant: 1. The promises of God, Father, Son, and Spirit, unto the baptized; 2. the vows of the baptized, in which he yields and binds himself unto the Father, Son, and Spirit.—Baptism, the gospel in its special application to the subject of baptism.—The right of pædo-baptism: 1. The Lord's title to the children of Christians; 2. the Christian children's title to the Lord.—The sanctification of pædo-baptism.—The doctrine of the holy Trinity in its practical significance: 1. A threefold gospel; 2. a threefold Christian calling; 3. a threefold creation and summons unto a spiritual life.—The religion of the Trinity and the religion of the Spirit are one.—Christ's servants should teach others what Christ has commanded, not command others what Christ has taught.—The blessing of the risen Lord unto His people: 1. Near all and with all; 2. every day, upon every way; 3. till the world's end; 4. and till the world is perfected.

Starke:—Man must contribute his part; then will God meet him with His promises.—*But some doubted*. Because they were so tardy in believing, we may receive their testimony as so much more trustworthy.—*Is given Me*: This is a divine, eternal power,—the foundation of the gospel, the ministerial office,—the ground of our responsibility to obey His commandments, of the baptismal covenant, and of His gracious presence in the Church.—This is the greatest loss, both at the appearance and the beginning of piety, in very many souls, that they will not deny their own strength, and cast themselves down at Christ's feet.—The boundless power and exaltation of Jesus Christ, the ground of faith and all consolation, from which we must obtain the victory over sin, death, the devil, hell, and the world.—Hitherto ye have been my disciples and scholars; but now ye are to become masters and teachers, and are to make disciples of others.—The preaching of the gospel, along with these attestations, is a precious and incomparable fruit of the death and resurrection of Christ.—To preach and administer the sacraments, are the chief duties of the New Testament minister, Acts iv. 6.—*Teaching them to observe*, Heb. vi. 1, 2; 2 Tim. iii. 15, 16.—To these duties belongs also the observance of the Lord's Supper.—*Zeisius*: It is not enough to be baptized, but there is likewise demanded a holy zeal, to live after the baptismal covenant, and to walk blameless, 1 Pet. iii. 21.—*Quesnel*: A preacher's true fidelity consists in this, that he preaches nothing but what he has learned from Jesus Christ.—Believest thou His promise, then canst thou in Him and through Him easily overcome all things.—[*Quesnel* adds this concluding prayer to his practical Com. on Matthew: Be Thou therefore with us always, O Lord, to be our light, our strength, and our consolation. Be with Thy Church, to be her steadfastness, her protection, and her holiness. Amen. —P. S.]

Lisco:—Christ even in His human nature is the administrator of the divine laws over men, yea, over all creatures.—I have been baptized; the pledge of God's grace unto me.—Baptism is an incorporation into the body of Christ, which is governed by His Spirit.

Gerlach:—*They worshipped Him*. That belief in the divinity of Christ, which was partly slumbering during His state of humiliation, is awakened in all, as with one blow, through this miraculously imposing view of the risen Saviour.—Acknowledgment of repentance and of faith, even when it was not yet associated with a clear knowledge concerning the Lord's person and teaching, was deemed sufficient by the Apostles to justify baptism, Acts ii. 41; viii. 12, 37; ix. 19; x. 47, 48; xvi. 33; xix. 5.—*Unto the end of the world; i. e.*, till the new world appears, in which God's kingdom is manifested in its glory. Their administration of baptism and their teaching were accordingly to be accompanied and blessed by His omnipresent, everywhere mighty, efficient power.

Heubner:—The authority of the Father continues, but He performs everything through the Son (and for the Son).—Thereupon rests also the obligation to worship Christ.—The Lord sends to His subjects.—Christ declares here distinctly the universality of His Church.* It was His own clear will to be a universal Saviour.—By the ordinance of Christ, baptism has the divine sanction for all times and peoples.—Teach them *all things*. Nothing is to be made obsolete. Nothing is contained in Christ's law which was merely a toleration of an error of the times.—*I am with you*: The most glorious word of consolation at parting. The most sublime conclusion of the gospel: 1. For all Christians unto all time. 2. The import of this promise. With His Spirit, and His actual manifestation of power.—Christ shall be preached to all in their own time, even in the other world.—The revelation of the glory of Jesus on parting from His Apostles and His Church.

Braune:—Previously, Christ had appeared suddenly, unexpectedly; now He makes a special appointment with them.—In Galilee, the despised province, He had the most friends.—Christ is the Lord of the visible and invisible Church, of the Church militant and triumphant.—[*Rieger*:] *Some doubted*: wonder not that in thy case, too, faith is a constant subjugation of unbelief.—In flaming hearts, the light of conviction must kindle.—*Is given Me*. With joyous assurance He awaited His departure. He had won so few, and His task embraced all peoples, all times, Eph. i. 20, 23.—If He is busy and efficient at creation, much more is He at regeneration.—The first disciples, Christians, became missionaries, messengers of salvation, as soon as the Church was founded at Pentecost. Upon that first feast of Pentecost, there were three thousand Christians; at the end of the first century, five hundred thousand; under the first Christian ruler, Constantine the Great, about ten millions; in the eighth century, some thirty millions; at the era of the Reformation, nearly one hundred millions; and now, well nigh two hundred millions.* — Missionaries from England and Ireland brought the gospel to Germany.†—The missionary work is the duty for the Church. There are still eight hundred millions who have not the gospel; one hundred and sixty millions Mohammedans, ten millions Jews, six hundred and thirty millions heathen.‡ —Missions are now beginning to receive from the Church that attention they demand. Oh, if it were only held fast: Go ye, preach the *gospel!* Many act as if the Redeemer said, the *Confession*.—[*Rieger*:] The preaching of the gospel is an address made in Christ's name unto the whole world: it has not to do with an emendation of the Jewish religion, nor with an elevation of heathen morality, nor with the establishment of civil rights; but it is a gospel of the kingdom, a proclamation that Jesus is the

* [The universality or catholicity of the Church, which unfolds itself gradually in the missionary work, is implied in the words: "Make disciples of *all nations*." The Edinb. edition renders *Allgemeinheit seiner Kirche* by "*equality* of His Church," which gives no sense at all in this connection.—P. S.]

* According to the calculation of Dr. Dieterici in Berlin, made in 1859, the number of Christians amounts to 335,000,000.—P. S.]

† [*Germany* is substituted for the original *to us* (*i. e., Germans*), which the Edinb. edition thoughtlessly retained. Germany gave to England, in the fifth century, its Anglo-Saxon population, which was subsequently christianized by missionaries from Rome (Augustine and his thirty companions sent out by Gregory I., A. D. 596); England sent a few centuries later the gospel to the Continent, mainly through Winfried or Boniface, "the apostle of Germany;" and Germany discharged the debt by giving to England, indirectly at least, the Protestant Reformation, in the sixteenth century. In America both nationalities meet in the nineteenth century to coalesce into one on the ground of their common Protestant Christianity.—P. S.]

‡ [According to Dieterici's calculation the religious statistics of the world in 1859 stood as follows:

Heathens	800,000,000
Mohammedans	160,000,000
Jews	5,000,000
Christians	335,000,000—P. S.]

Lord; a gospel of glory, that the Son of God hath appeared and taken away the power from death, and from the subjection unto vanity, beneath which the whole creation groaneth, etc.—Baptism. *Immersion*, which signifies the death and burial of sinful humanity, became an *aspersion* to signify the outpouring of the Holy Spirit for the soul's renewal, or a *sprinkling* to indicate purification and dedication, sanctification of heart and life; the external mode may change (but still the idea must obtain the same depth, Rom. vi. 4, viz., to be baptized into the death of Christ to a new life). — Baptism is the sacrament through which one becomes a Christian.—*Lo, I am with you:* He is not coming, He is here: 1. He is with weak and strong; 2. in battle as in victory; 3. in life and in death; 4. in time and eternity.—Here Jesus is with us in His word, there we shall be with Him in His glory.—*Uhle:* What the exalted Son of man in His exaltation is unto men: 1. What do His friends possess in Him? He is, (*a*) their royal Brother; (*b*) their eternal High-Priest; (*c*) their almighty Protector; (*d*) the unfailing Accomplisher of their perfection. 2. What do His enemies possess in Him? He is, (*a*) their almighty King; (*b*) an omniscient Witness; (*c*) a patient Forbearer; (*d*) a righteous Judge.—*Ahlfeld:* The last will of our Lord Jesus Christ: 1. Believe on the Risen One; 2. extend the Church; 3. console thyself with the Lord's gracious assistance.—*Heubner:* The everlasting endurance of the kingdom of Jesus Christ.

[Matthew Henry:—*Alway, i. e.*, all days, every day. I will be with you, on Sabbath days, on week days, fair days and foul days, winter days and summer days. There is no day, no hour of the day, in which our Lord Jesus is not present with His churches and His ministers; if there were, that day, that hour, they were undone. The God of Israel, the Saviour, is sometimes a God that *hideth Himself* (Isa. xl. 15), but never a God that *absenteth Himself;* sometimes *in the dark*, but never *at a distance*.—*With you:* 1. With you and *your writings:* the divine power of the Scriptures continues to the end of time; 2. with you and *your successors:* all the ministers of the Apostles, all to whom the commission extends to baptize and to teach; [3. with you and all true *disciples*, comp. Matt. xviii. 20].—Chrysostom:—*Lo, I am with you alway*, etc. As much as to say: Tell Me not of the difficulty of all these things, seeing I am with you, who can make all things easy. A like promise He often made to the prophets of the O. T., to Jeremiah, who pleaded his youth; to Moses and to Ezekiel, when they would have shunned the office imposed upon them. The promise is not to the Apostles only, who were not to continue till the end of the world, but with them to all who shall believe after them. He says this to the faithful as one body.—P. Schaff:—The unbroken succession of Christ's life through all ages of Christendom (or, the true doctrine of the apostolic succession): 1. A glorious fact; 2. an irresistible evidence of Christianity; 3. an unfailing source of strength and encouragement to the believer. —Christ's presence with His people: 1. In the Holy Spirit, who reveals Christ to us and unites us to Him; 2. in the Church which is His body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all; 3. in His word; 4. in His sacraments, especially the Lord's Supper, where He offers Himself to the believer as his spiritual food; 5. in the hearts of believers, who live in Him as He in them, the hope of glory.—Christ's omnipresence in the Church: 1. Its nature: (*a*) spiritual real; (*b*) divine-human; (*c*) mediatorial and saving; 2. its warning; 3. its comfort in life and in death.—Christ's presence with His members on earth till His coming; their presence with Him in heaven, where they shall see Him as He is, to glorify and enjoy Him forever.—P. S.]

ADDENDA.

BY THE AMERICAN EDITOR.

THE Sinaitic Manuscript of the Bible, which Professor Tischendorf rescued from the obscurity of the Convent of St. Catharine on Mount Sinai, and carefully edited in two editions in 1862 and 1863,* two years after the issue of the third edition of Dr. Lange's Commentary on Matthew, has been carefully compared in preparing the American edition of this work from Chapter VIII. to the close of the Gospel of Matthew. I thought I was the first to do so, but just before I finished the last pages of this volume, I found that Bäumlein, in his Commentary on the Gospel of St. John,† and Meyer, in the fifth edition of his Commentary on Matthew, both of which appeared in 1864, had preceded me, at least in print. No critical scholar can ignore this manuscript hereafter. For it is the only complete, and perhaps the oldest of all the uncial codices of the Bible, or at least of the same age and authority as the celebrated Vatican Codex (which is traced by some to the middle of the fourth century), and far better edited by the German Protestant Professor, Tischendorf, than the latter was by the Italian Cardinal, Angelo Mai. In the absence of a simpler mark agreed upon by critics (the proposed designation by the Hebrew א has not yet been adopted, and is justly objected to by Tregelles and others on the ground of typographical inconvenience), I introduce it always as *Cod. Sin.*, and I find that Dr. Meyer in the fifth edition does the same. As I could not procure a copy of the printed edition of this Codex till I had finished the first seven chapters, I now complete the critical part of the work by adding its more important readings in the first seven chapters where they differ from the *textus receptus*, on which the authorized English, as well as all the older Protestant Versions of the Greek Testament are substantially based.

* NOVUM TESTAMENTUM SINAITICUM, sive Novum Testamentum cum Epistola Barnabæ et Fragmentis Pastoris (Hermæ). Ex *Codice Sinaitico* auspiciis Alexandri II., omnium Russiarum imperatoris, ex tenebris protracto orbique litterarum tradito accurate descripsit ÆNOTHEUS FRIDERICUS CONSTANTINUS TISCHENDORF, theol. et phil. Dr., etc. etc. Lipsiæ, 1863. The text is arranged in four columns and covers 148 folios; the learned *Prolegomena* of the editor lxxxi folios. There is besides a magnificent photo-lithographed fac-simile edition of the whole Sinaitic Bible, published at the expense of the Emperor of Russia, in 4 volumes (3 for the Old and 1 for the New Testament, the latter in 148 folios), under the title: BIBLIORUM CODEX SINAITICUS PETROPOLITANUS. Auspiciis augustissimis imperatoris Alexandri II. ed. Const. Tischendorf. Petropoli, 1862. A copy of this rare edition I have also consulted occasionally, in the Astor Library of New York. For fuller information on this important Codex (in the words of Tischendorf: "*omnium codicum uncialium solus integer omniumque antiquissimus*"), we must refer the reader to the ample *Prolegomena* of TISCHENDORF, also to an article of HILGENFELD in his *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, vol. vii. (1864), p. 74 ff. (who is disposed to assign it to a somewhat later age), and to SCRIVENER's treatise, which I have not seen.

† Hengstenberg, in his Commentary on John, concluded in 1863, pays no attention whatever to this Codex, and is very defective in a critical point of view.

CH. I. 6.—Cod. Sin. omits the second ὁ βασιλεύς, *the king*, after *David*. *See* Commentary, *Crit. Note* 1 on p. 48.

v. 18.—Cod. Sin. sustains γένεσις, *birth, nativity* (B., C., P., S., Z., etc., Lachmann, Tischendorf, Alford) for the *lect. rec.* γέννησις, which may easily have arisen from ἐγέννησε and ἐγεννήθη, and as appearing to suit the connection better (*partus modus*), comp. Meyer, in the fifth ed., p. 43. But Christ's origin was not properly a *begetting, engendering*, γέννησις (from γεννάω); and hence γένεσις is preferable both for internal and external reasons. Comp. Luke i. 14: ἐπὶ τῇ γενέσει αὐτοῦ, which is better supported there than γεννήσει.

v. 19.—Cod. Sin.: δειγματισαι for the *lect. rec.* παραδειγματίσαι; the παρα in Cod. Sin. being "*punctis notatum rursus deletis*," as Tischendorf remarks, *Proleg.* p. xlii, which I found to be correct on inspection of the fac-simile edition in the Astor Library. The sense, however, is not altered, since both δειγματίζω (only once, Col. ii. 15) and παραδειγματίζω (twice, Matt. i. 19 and Heb. vi. 6) mean *to make a show* or *example of one, to put to shame*. Lachmann, Tischendorf (ed. septima critica major, 1859), Alford (4th ed. of 1859), and Meyer (5th ed., but omitting to notice the original reading of Cod. Sin.) read δειγματίσαι on the authority of B., Z., and scholia of Origen and Eusebius.

v. 25.—Cod. Sin. reads simply: ετεκεν υιον, instead of the *lect. rec.*: ἔτεκε τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς τὸν πρωτότοκον, and here sustains the testimony of Codd. B., Z., etc., and the modern critical editions. The omission of πρωτότοκον is much easier accounted for, on doctrinal grounds, than its insertion, and cannot affect the controversy concerning the question of the brothers of Christ, since πρωτότοκος is genuine in Luke ii. 7, where there is no variation of reading. On the other hand, the term does not *necessarily* prove that Mary had children after Jesus. Comp. *Crit. Note* 2, on p. 52, and the remark of Jerome, quoted in Tischendorf's crit. apparatus (ed. 7. p. 4).

CH. II. 11.—Cod. Sin. reads: ιδον (εἶδον), *they saw* (as in the Eng. Ver.), for εὗρον, *they found* (Vulg.: *invenerunt*).

v. 18.—Cod. Sin. omits θρῆνος καί, *lamentation and*, before κλαυθμός, *weeping*. So all the critical editors. The *text. rec.* seems to be enlarged from the Septuagint.

CH. III. 3.—δια ησαιου, *through Isaiah*, instead of ὑπὸ Ἡσαΐου, *by Isaiah*. The reading διά is sustained also by Codd. B., C., D., Syr., Sahid., Æth., Vulg., Griesb., Lachm., Tischend., Alf., and is more correct; for the word was spoken *by* the Lord *through* Isaiah (*a Domino per*, as Irenæus has it). Hence insert in text on p. 67 after *by:* [*through*, διά].

v. 6.—Cod. Sin.: ιορδανη ποταμω (also in Codd. B., C′., M., Δ., etc.) for Ἰορδάνῃ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ. But ποταμῷ, *river*, may have been inserted from Mark i. 5.

CH. IV. 5.—Cod. Sin.: εστησεν, *text. rec.*: ἵστησιν (E. V.: *setteth*). Lachmann and Alford adopt ἔστησεν with B., C., D., Z., while Tischendorf (7 ed., 1859) and Meyer retain ἵστησιν. The aorist interrupts the flow of the *præsens historicum* in this verse (παραλαμβάνει . . . λέγει), comp. vers. 8 and 10, and may have been a correction from Luke iv. 9.

v. 10.—ὀπίσω μου, *behind me*, is wanting in Cod. Sin., as in other important witnesses, and in Elzevir's ed. (*see* the apparatus in the crit. editions), and is probably an old insertion from Matt. xvi. 23, where Peter is addressed. Comp. Lange's *Exeg. Note* on ch. iv. 10, p. 85.

CH. V. 11.—Cod. Sin. sustains the *lect. rec.* ψευδόμενοι (E. V. *falsely*), which was suspected by Griesbach, and thrown out of the text by Fritzsche, Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Meyer, who says (fifth ed. p. 135) rather too dogmatically: "*Das entbehrliche und den Nerv der Rede nur schwächende Wort ist ein frommer, ungefügiger, und daher auch verschieden gestellter Zusatz*. Comp. *Crit. Note* 2 on p. 98.

v. 30.—Cod. Sin. sustains the Vatican Codex, Vulgata (*eat*), etc., Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Alford, in reading εἰς γέενναν ἀπέλθῃ, *should depart into hell*, instead of the *lect. rec.*

βληθῇ εἰς γέενναν, *should be cast into hell*, which seems to be a correction to suit the preceding verse.

v. 44.—Cod. Sin. reads simply: αγαπατε τους εχθρους υμων και προσευχεσθε υπερ των διωκοντων, *love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you*, and omits after ὑμῶν the words from εὐλογεῖτε to μισοῦσιν ὑμᾶς (*bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you*), and after ὑπὲρ τῶν the words: ἐπηρεαζόντων ὑμᾶς καί (*who despitefully use you and*). It agrees in this omission with Cod. B., Copt., Iren., Orig., Euseb., and other fathers. Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Alford, expunge the words referred to, as an interpolation from Luke vi. 28; but de Wette and Meyer object, since the order of the clauses in Luke is different, and since the homœoteleuta could easily cause omissions. The words ἐπηρεαζόντων ὑμᾶς καί, however, are very suspicious, and in all probability inserted from Luke vi. 28. Hence Meyer, also, gives them up.

v. 47.—Cod. Sin. sustains ἐθνικοί, *heathen*, with B., D., Z., verss. and fathers against τελῶναι, *publicans*, which seems to have been inserted from ver. 46, as already remarked on p. 112, *Crit. Note* 6.

CH. VI. 1.—Cod. Sin. agrees here again with the Vatican MS. (also D., Syr., Hieros., Itala, Vulgata, several fathers, Lachm., Tischend., Treg., Alf.), in reading δικαιοσύνην, *righteousness*, instead of ἐλεημοσύνην (*text. rec.*, Matthäi, Scholz), which is "a mistaken gloss, the general nature of this opening caution not being perceived."

v. 12.—Cod. Sin. (also B., Z.): ἀφήκαμεν (*have forgiven*) against the *lect. rec.*: ἀφίεμεν, and the reading of D., E., L., etc.: ἀφίομεν, which may have been taken from Luke xi. 4. Lachm., Tischend., Alford, and Meyer, favor ἀφήκαμεν.

v. 13.—Cod. Sin. omits the doxology and the *amen* in the Lord's Prayer, with other ancient witnesses and all the modern critical editors, German and English, except Matthaei, whose exclusive adherence to his own Moscow manuscripts gives his edition the character of partiality. It is generally regarded as an insertion from the ecclesiastical liturgies in the fourth century. On the other hand, it is strongly defended as genuine, not only by Stier, as mentioned on p. 122, but also by Scrivener (*A Supplement to the authorized English Version of the N. T.*, vol. i. 1845, p. 155 ff.). Alford's testimony against it, as quoted on p. 122, is certainly too strong. The importance of the case will justify us in adding here the principal arguments on both sides of the question. It must be admitted that the *weight* (though by no means the *number*) of critical testimony is rather against the doxology. Four of the most ancient uncial MSS., Cod. Sin. (4th cent.), Vaticanus (B., 4th cent.), Cantabrigiensis, or Codex Bezæ (D., 5th or 6th cent.), Dublinensis rescriptus (Z., of the 6th cent., containing, of the N. T., the Gospel of Matthew with many lacunæ), and five cursive MSS. (1, 17, 118, 130, 209, of much later date), moreover the ancient Latin versions, and most of the early fathers, especially the Latin ones, including Origen, Tertullian, and Cyprian, who wrote practical commentaries on the Lord's Prayer, omit the doxology. The other uncial MSS. are here defective, and cannot be quoted for or against. Cod. Alexandrinus (A., 5th cent.) is mutilated from Matt. i. to xxv. 6 (its first leaf commencing: ὁ νυμφίος), and Cod. Ephraemi Syri (C., 5th cent.) omits Matt. v. 16 to vii. 4 (according to Tischendorf's edition, which is, however, unfortunately not in fac-simile). Its omission from the text is, moreover, much more difficult to account for than its insertion from the ancient liturgies. But on the other hand, the doxology is already found in the venerable Peschito (of the second century), and the two younger Syriac Versions (Philoxeniana and Hierosolymitana), in the Sahidic or Thebaic Egyptian Version (which ranks next to the Peschito on the score of antiquity), the Æthiopic, Armenian, Gothic and Gregorian Versions, in the Apostolical Constitutions, Chrysostom, as well as in nearly all the five hundred or more cursive man

uscripts in which the sixth chapter of Matthew is preserved. As to internal reasons, it can hardly be urged that the doxology interrupts the context or the logical connection between vers. 12 and 14 (Scholz, Meyer, Alford); for this argument would require us to cancel the whole of ver. 13 (Scrivener). No one can doubt the eminent propriety of this solemn conclusion which we are accustomed to regard from infancy as an integral part of the prayer of prayers, and which we would now never think of sacrificing to critical considerations in our popular Bibles and public and private devotions. Probably it was the prevailing custom of the Christians in the East from the beginning to pray the Lord's Prayer with the doxology, comp. 2 Tim. iv. 18. Chrysostom comments on it without the least consciousness that its authenticity is doubtful.

In the seventh chapter Cod. Sin. offers no important deviations from the received text.

CH. VII. 2.—Cod. Sin. sustains with the best ancient authorities *μετρηθήσεται*, *shall be measured*, which is now adopted by the editors of the Greek text (even Stier and Theile, and Wordsworth, who adhere closely to the Elzevir text), against the *lect. rec.* *ἀντιμετρηθήσεται*, *shall be measured again*, or *in turn* (from Luke vi. 38).

	COD. SIN.	TEXT. REC.
v. 4.—	*λεγις* (*λέγεις*)	*ἐρεῖς*.
v. 13.—	*εισελθατε*	*εἰσέλθετε*.
v. 14.—	*οτι στενη**	
" —	*πλατια*	*πλατεῖα ἡ πύλη* (so B.).
v. 21.—	*τα θεληματα*	*τὸ θέλημα* (so also B.).
v. 24.—	*ομοιωθησεται*	*ὁμοιώσω αὐτόν*.
v. 27.—	*ηλθαν*	*ἦλθον*.
v. 28.—	*ετελεσεν*	*συνετέλεσεν*
v. 29.—	*γραμματεις αυτων*	*γραμματεῖς*.

* But it is not certain whether *ὅτι* or *τί* was the original reading. Tischendorf remarks, *Proleg.* xliii. ad membranam iv. exteriorem: "*οτι*: *ο* litteræ punctum impositum; nescio an ante C^a. jam B imposuerit; obelum vero solus C^a addidit." *Ὅτι στενή*, *for strait*, is the reading of the *text. rec.* and retained by Tischendorf and Alford, but it may easily have arisen from *ὅτι πλατεῖα*, ver. 13. Lachmann, Meyer, and Scrivener prefer *τί στενή*, *how strait* (Vulgata: *quam angusta*), which has the balance of external evidence in its favor.

4